



MARXISM IS DEAD

Published by the Author
At Nicholson Road, Lajpat Street,
Lahore.

Copyright by the Author. All Rights reserved

Printed by
Chas. Wollen, Managing Proprietor,
Northern India Printing and Publishing Co.
11-B, Lawrence Road, Lahore.

CONTENTS

I.	A FORE-RUNNER OF MARX :		
	SAINT AMAND BAZARD	...	1
II.	DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM :		
	QUANTITY AND QUALITY	...	24
III.	DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM :		
	NEGATION OF THE NEGATION	...	58
IV.	A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA	...	95
V.	RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM		133
VI.	THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE	...	188
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	...	223
	APPENDIX: QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS	...	233

PREFACE

"THE book will bring me little credit in socialist circles"—I said in introducing *Indian Socialism* to the reader at the end of 1936.

I can speak with greater confidence about the present volume. *Marxism is Dead* is certain to bring me much discredit in socialist circles.

The patient investigation of economic facts, when it suggests disagreeable conclusions, elicits no praise but much abuse in India, even vulgar abuse. This is not surprising, considering the ignorance of the general public on economic questions, which is profound.

That is how we have come to believe that the economic regeneration of India will be brought about by *gur*, *charkha* and *khaddar*, and that *charkha* and the technique of 'fasting unto death' may be trusted to defend India against foreign aggression.

And that is also how we have been led to think that the U. S. S. R. is a Marxist country, that it is the greatest democracy in the world, that exploitation of man by man is at an end there, that soon Russian socialism will be transformed into communism, and, last but not least, that Russia is 'the base of the world revolution'—Russia which is ready to guarantee imperialist territory if only imperialism will guarantee socialist territory!

I am indebted to the Editor, *Tribune*, for permission to use my articles in the *Tribune* on Marxism and other subjects. And I cannot thank Mrs. Indumati Roop Krishna enough for the artistic jacket, which expresses the main thesis of the book better than all the words I have employed.

LAHORE :

B. N.

1st June, 1939.

MARXISM IS DEAD

CHAPTER I.

A FORE-RUNNER OF MARX

SAINT AMAND BAZARD (1791-1832).

In India a socialist must be a Marxist, or he is not a socialist at all. Any one who has the temerity to criticise Marx, even the labour theory (which Marx uncritically borrowed from Ricardo) is immediately dubbed an enemy of socialism, a fascist, an agent of capitalists, or a 'lackey of capital'. It is not realised that there was socialism before Marx was born. Marx's own contribution to socialism was distinct. We shall examine it in subsequent chapters. Here it is necessary to state that even if Marxism were totally rejected socialism would still remain.

In this chapter we are concerned with the system of a precursor of Marx, who has generally been ignored. This is Bazard, a disciple of St. Simon. Bazard's teaching was different from that of his master in an important respect. St. Simon favoured a wide diffusion of property among the masses, while Bazard advocated socialisation of all instruments of production.

In 1829 (when Marx was 11 years old) Bazard and two other disciples of St. Simon delivered a series of lectures at Paris on the teachings of their master, which have been recently reprinted ¹.

¹ *Doctrine de Saint-Simon, Exposition Première Année, 1829* new edition published with introduction and notes by C. Bouglé et Elie Halévy, Paris, 1924. Marcel Rivière.



MARXISM IS DEAD

The reader's attention is invited to the opening paragraphs of the *Communist Manifesto* (1847)². Marx is not original. The antagonism between the classes in the past had been described more fully by Bazard.

The word used for class-war by Bazard is generally *antagonisme* and sometimes *lutte* (struggle). He says :

"Antagonism, having as its cause the rule of physical force and as its result the exploitation of man by man : this is the most salient fact of all past". (*Voilà le fait le plus saillant de tout la passé*).³

The rule of physical force and the exploitation of man by man are inter-related. There is exploitation of man by man because of the rule of physical force. And

² *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. ~~Eng. Trs.~~ Eng. Trs. Published by Martin Lawrence, London :

"The history of all hitherto existing ~~societies~~ is the history of class struggles.

"Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

"In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebians, slaves ; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guildmasters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs ; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

"The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

"Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature : it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat."

³ Bazard, p. 213.

both are cause and effect of the state of antagonism.

Classes and antagonism have existed in all times and in all places, in India and Egypt, as also in Greece and Rome, under the government of priests as under that of patricians. The governing class used its political power to exploit the governed, in fact "the distinctions established between the classes or the castes are in an equal measure the political expression of the different degrees of exploitation of man by man". This exploitation is "the most characteristic phenomenon of the past" (*le phénomène le plus caractéristique du passé*).⁴

Bazard next describes the various forms of exploitation and their connection with the ownership of property. In the beginning exploitation embraces the whole life, material, intellectual and moral, of the person exploited. The slave is his master's property, like land or cattle. He has no recognised right, not even that to live; he has no name, no family, no property, no religious existence: "in short he can never claim to acquire the goods that have been denied him, nor even think of it"⁵.

In course of time the condition of the slave becomes less arduous; the legislator intervenes in his relations with his master.

The plebian is a little better off than the slave. He is not exploited so brutally as the slave, "but still in a very high degree and under the same relations"⁶. The plebian enjoys neither a religious nor a political, nor even a civil existence, since as a plebian he cannot possess either property or a family, these privileges being reserved for the patrician.

⁴ Bazard, pp. 213-214. ⁵ Ibid, pp. 215-216. ⁶ Ibid, p. 216

MARXISM IS DEAD

It is true that the plebian can acquire these rights, but only by delegation, or in the name of the patrician.

The plebian's condition was more favourable than that of the slave and he also won his enfranchisement earlier.

The serf is not the property of his master, like the slave, but he is attached to the soil. He is entitled to a portion of the fruits of his labour and he has a family. He is protected by the civil law and, better still, by the religious law. Soon he obtains the right of locomotion, or he is no longer attached to the soil and can choose his master. But even after being enfranchised 'the old serf still remains, in certain respects, marked by the seal of slavery'⁷. For long periods he has to submit to personal service, to forced labour, or feudal fines which are the price of his liberty. But gradually the burdens of the serfs become lighter.

Bazard notes that 'antagonism itself has civilised the world.' "Kant", said Bazard, "noted this before us; yes, gentlemen, the institution of slavery, succeeding the most ferocious brutality or the most savage appetites, has, in its origin, favoured the development of human society"⁸.

The victors turned their captives into slaves and used them as instruments of wealth production.

In a subsequent lecture (seventh of the series) Bazard described the advance that feudalism represented on the previous state of affairs. Before the rise of feudalism the spirit of egoism, of individuality, prevailed 'like that which today dominates our industrialists'⁹. The governing principle was that of competition, of liberty, not merely in wars between different countries, but in the

⁷ Bazard, p. 218.

⁸ Ibid. p. 225.

⁹ Ibid. p. 263.

A FORE-RUNNER OF MARX

same country between different provinces, different cantons, different towns and different castles. Feudalism put an end to military anarchy in bringing together the dukes, counts and barons and all other independent landlords and military men in mutual service and protection—an 'immense advantage' which was not sufficiently appreciated, according to Bazard, by any historian of the 18th century ¹⁰.

In the course of time exploitation has tended to become weaker. In present-day society antagonism, the rule of physical force, and exploitation of man by man have become so much softened and have assumed such indirect forms that at first they almost escape attention; "nevertheless they exist and their intensity is still very great" ¹¹.

The relations between landlords (owners of property) and workers, employers and employees today are not the same as those between masters and slaves, plebians and patricians, seigneurs and serfs of the past—in fact, there is no comparison, and yet one must recognise that modern relations are only a prolongation or continuation of the old. "The relation of the master to the employee is the last transformation undergone by slavery" ¹². The form of exploitation has changed; it has also lost the old brutal characteristics, but 'it is none the less real.' The worker engages himself to work for his employer. It may seem as if the transaction is freely entered into by the worker. "It is not," says Bazard, "since the worker is compelled to agree to it on pain of death, reduced as he is

¹⁰ Bazard, p. 263. For those times the historical role of feudalism was as 'revolutionary' as that of the bourgeoisie in a later epoch.

¹¹ Ibid. p. 236. ¹² Ibid. p. 238.

to getting his day's food from work of the preceding day" ¹³.

The moral dogma has been accepted by society that no one should suffer from incapacity on account of his birth. It might have been expected in consequence that the composition of various classes of society would become modified on account of 'a continual exchange of families and individuals composing them.' But, ignoring exceptional cases, such exchange does not take place; 'the advantages and disadvantages belonging to each social position are transmitted by heredity,' which gives rise in society to a class of *proletaires* (the proletariat) ¹⁴. The workers own no property, and the whole mass of workers is exploited by those who own it. In such a state of affairs 'the worker appears as a direct descendant of the slave and the serf' ¹⁵.

It will be noted that Bazard connects exploitation with the ownership of property, *i.e.*, instruments of production, by landlords and capitalists. In his seventh discourse he thus defined property:—

"Property, in the most generally accepted sense of the word, is composed of goods which are not destined for immediate consumption, and which today give a right to an income (*revenu*). In this sense property includes lands and capital (*les fonds de terre et les capitaux*), that is to say, in the language of economists, the instruments of production (*le fonds de production*). For us land and capital, whatever their form, are instruments of labour (*instruments du travail*); landlords and capitalists (two classes which in this connection cannot be distinguished one from the other)

13 Bazard, p. 238.

14 Ibid. p. 239.

15 Ibid. p. 239.

are the *depositaires* (depositories, trustees) of these instruments; their function is to distribute them among the workers" ¹⁶.

The prime or most important cause of the exploitation of workers by landlords and capitalists is ownership by the latter of the instruments of labour. Landlords and capitalists, small in numbers as compared to the class of workers, have been invested by law, "born of the law of conquest, with a monopoly of *richesses*, that is to say with the power of disposing over, according to their pleasure, even in idleness, the instruments of labour" ¹⁷.

Bazard next describes the material, intellectual and moral exploitation of the worker. It is with genuine feeling that he writes: "No one thinks of him; physical misery has led to brutishness, brutishness to depravity, which is the source of fresh misery; a vicious circle each point of which inspires disgust and horror when it should inspire only pity" ¹⁸.

Such, said Bazard, was the condition of the majority of the workers. And yet these facts remained unnoticed by political thinkers. They talked of progress, liberty, philanthropy. They boasted of the regime of equality which had been inaugurated, since all citizens had become admissible to public employment; they regarded their age as one of the highest enlightenment, of the highest civilization. Empty words! No revolution deserved a

¹⁶ Bazard, pp. 256-57. The School of Saint Simon use the term '*fonds de consommation*' for what are now known as consumers' goods, and '*fonds de production*' for producers' goods. '*Fonds de production*' include tools, machines, factory buildings, raw materials, land, and animals which assist man's productive labour. See Bazard, p. 256. Bazard uses the word *richesses* in the same sense.

¹⁷ Bazard, p. 239.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 240.

MARXISM IS DEAD

permanent place in history which did not ameliorate the condition of the most numerous class. The French Revolution had failed to do so, and a new revolution was needed to put an end to the exploitation of man by man completely and in all its forms. Bazard considered such a revolution inevitable ¹⁹.

Since property was the source, the prime cause of this exploitation, this new revolution would change the constitution of property. Property was generally viewed as an unalterable fact, since it was the base or foundation of the political order. Yes, Bazard would admit, in general terms, that property was the base of the political order, but he insisted: "Property is a social fact, subject, like all other social facts, to the law of progress" ²⁰. The constitution of property must change "since, in virtue of this constitution, people are born with the privilege of living without doing anything, that is to say, of living at the expense of others, which is only a prolongation of exploitation of man by man." It followed that in order to end the exploitation of man by man it was necessary to change the constitution of property ²¹.

PLANNED PRODUCTION.

There are two main demands of socialism:—(a) for social justice, or a demand that exploitation of man by man shall cease, and (b) for planned, regulated production, or a demand that the present state of anarchy in production which leads to recurrent crises, shall end.

We have seen that Bazard would change the constitution of property to end exploitation. In regard to crises,

19 Bazard, p. 241. 20 Ibid. p. 244. 21 Ibid. pp. 244-45.

A FORE-RUNNER OF MARX

Sismondi, before the School of St. Simon, had pointed out the connection between over-production and under-consumption. Under large-scale production goods are produced in larger and larger quantities which only the masses, that is the class of workers, can absorb. But the profit of the large-scale producer is limited by the difference between the price at which his products are sold and the cost of production. Now cost largely consists in the workers' wages; the industrialist cannot sell his goods at a profit since he does not pay enough wages to enable his workers to buy the entire products of their labour. Chronic over-production in modern society thus rests on the wage-system. The only means of getting rid of the surplus products of industry under the wage-system is selling the surplus in backward countries, where industrialism and the wage-system have not yet developed.

This is Sismondi's explanation of crises. Bazard's line of argument is different. His explanation is based on the evils of unlimited competition.

If society may be viewed as a Collective Being (as Bazard viewed it) who grows from generation to generation as an individual grows year by year in obedience to a law of progress²², war of man against man and class against class is a contradiction which should be removed. In the economic sphere this war takes the form of competition. The sentiment dominating industry is egoism—each one for himself: "The industrialist cares little for the interests of society. His family, his instruments of labour and the personal fortune which he endeavours to make: this is his humanity, his universe, his God"²³. It is

²² Bazard, p. 160.

²³ Ibid. p. 139.

MARXISM IS DEAD

thought that even where each selfishly pursues his own interest, somehow the interests of all are promoted. The theory of *laissez faire, laissez passer* supposes that individual interests are always in harmony with the general interest. But 'facts without number belie it.' Bazard gives one example, 'out of a thousand.' It may be in the interest of society to use machines driven by steam power, but what about the hand-worker? The usual answer to this objection is that the industry of printing has created more employment than unemployment, and the conclusion is drawn that in the end everything gets adjusted (*tout finit par se niveler*). "Admirable conclusion," exclaims Bazard ironically. "And until the adjustment is complete, what shall we do with thousands of starving men? Will our arguments console them? Will they bear their misery patiently, because statistical calculations prove that in a certain number of years they will have bread?"²⁴.

Bazard does not blame the inventor of machines, but "social foresight should bring it about that the conquests of industry are not like those of war; there should be no funeral chants mingling with paeans of joy."

It is the result of unregulated competition that the equilibrium between production and consumption is disturbed every moment, which explains the innumerable catastrophies or commercial crises:

"Let us cast a glance on the society surrounding us. Numerous crises, deplorable catastrophies, afflict industry daily; they have attracted the attention of a few people, but they are ignorant of the cause of such great disorder; they do not see that the disorder is the result of the operation of unlimited competition"²⁵.

²⁴ Bazard, p 141.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 141.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 267.

It is evident that the prime cause of industrial confusion and crises is to be sought in the ownership of means of production by the class of landlords and capitalists by right of birth. They set people to work by providing them with the instruments of labour, of which they have the monopoly. They perform a social function, but do they perform it cheaply and intelligently and in a manner favouring the increase of industrial products? The answer is in the negative. They pay themselves handsomely for their services, considering the abundance in which they live. "On the other hand, considering the violent crises, the disastrous catastrophies which so often desolate industry, it is evident that those who distribute the instruments of labour perform their task with little understanding" ²⁷. Bazard does not blame them for their inefficiency. The direction of productive activity requires a profound knowledge of the relation between production and consumption, and of the mechanism which moves the wheels of industry. It cannot be assumed that those who have come to own land and capital by right of birth will necessarily possess the requisite knowledge and skill to adjust production to consumption.

Three conditions must be fulfilled if equilibrium between production and consumption is to be established : (1) that instruments of labour are distributed according to the needs of each locality and each branch of industry ; (2) that this distribution takes place on the ground of individual capacity, so that instruments of labour are placed in the most capable hands ; and (3) that production is so

²⁷ Bazard, p. 258.

MARXISM IS DEAD

organized that there is never any fear of scarcity or a surplus in any branch of production.

Under existing conditions the distribution of instruments of labour is made by individual capitalists and landlords. Each acts according to his individual judgment and knowledge. Production is not determined by a general view of the entire process. Bazard says :—

“It (production) takes place without discernment, without forethought; it is short at one point, excessive at another; it is to the want of a general view of the requirements of consumption and of the resources of production that industrial crises must be attributed”²⁸.

The remedy lies in putting an end to anarchy in production through the creation of an organization which would co-ordinate all efforts. Unitary direction is to be substituted for no direction, or the separate individual judgments of industrialists.

Was no effort ever made in the past to co-ordinate human efforts in the sphere of material activity? Bazard answers the question in the affirmative. History shows that societies have ceaselessly endeavoured to subject the use of force, in the domain of material activity, to *une direction unitaire* or single, unified direction²⁹.

In former times war was a predominant form of material activity, wealth was sought through conquest. War was always an organized affair. Institutions thus came into existence for regularizing the distribution of instruments of work (*i.e.* implements of war), and of functions, which then consisted in arms, military posts and ranks.

“These institutions directed all the efforts of barbar-

²⁸ Bazard. p. 258.

²⁹ Ibid. p. 262.

ous workers, hierarchically graded, towards the accomplishment of a common aim. Production by pillage and conquest, distribution of their products, consumption of the objects looted or conquered, were regulated, so far as the ignorance and ferocity of those times permitted, by competent authority; for the chiefs of warrior nations were skilled warriors" ³⁰.

Now if war has its organization, why not peace? Bazard expresses this idea in an important passage:—

"Even as the elements of *belligerent* activities of the 9th century tended to form a *society* possessing its hierarchy, its chiefs, and a complete systematization of all *interests*, of all *duties*, similarly the elements of *peaceful* activity tend at the present time to constitute a single society possessing its chiefs, its hierarchy, an organization and a common destiny" ³¹.

Bazard then refers to French corporations and other inadequate means of regulating industry. The institution of banking meets with his approval: "The creation of this industry is evidently a first step towards order" ³². But banking as practised in an individualist regime has its limitations. The majority of industrial transactions, properly so-called, took place in Bazard's time without the assistance of bankers; further, in granting credit bankers take account of material guarantees offered for the loan, not, what is of greater importance, of the capacity of the borrower ³³.

Bazard proceeds to describe the social institution of the future which would direct all industrial activity in the

30 Bazard, p. 262.

31 Ibid. p. 264.

32 Ibid. p. 267-8.

33 Ibid. p. 271.

MARXISM IS DEAD

interests of society as a whole, and particularly the workers. This institution is a system of general banking. In the words of Bazard :

“The system will at first comprise a central bank representing the Government in the material sphere, this bank will be the *depositaire* (depository, trustee) of all *richesses* ³⁴, of the entire means of production, of all instruments of labour, in one word, of what at present composes entire individual property” ³⁵. •

Under the central bank there will be banks of the second degree, built on the same model. These secondary banks will keep the central bank in touch with the principal localities, their requirements and their productive resources. Under the secondary banks there will be subordinate special banks with more restricted spheres of operation. The special banks will look after the ‘weakest branches of the tree of industry.’

All demands would converge on the superior banks, and from the superior banks would radiate all efforts. The general bank would grant credit to localities, that is to say, would provide them with instruments of labour, only after balancing and combining their diverse operations; these credits would then be distributed among workers by special banks representing the different branches of industry.

Would such an organization of banking be able to regulate production and avert crises? Ryazanoff says, “No” ³⁶.

Now we are not concerned with the proposals of Saint Simonians in general, but those of Bazard alone, to whom Ryazanoff does not refer.

³⁴ *Richesses*, literally wealth, but Bazard uses the term in the sense of producers' goods. ³⁵ Ibid. p. 273. ³⁶ Ryazanoff says in the

PROPERTY

Obviously it would be impossible for the central bank of Bazard to regulate production if private property in means of production continued to exist. Private property in means of production carries with it the right to make such use of capital goods as the owner thinks fit. In a regime of private property individual initiative is free and unfettered and no combined, co-ordinated efforts in production under a single direction are possible such as Bazard considered essential for regulating production. Bazard's view of property must be in harmony with his general scheme of regulating production, or production cannot be regulated at all.

Bazard denounced property inherited by birth. He argued that justification existed for a change in the constitution of property. Law had intervened before. The slave had ceased to be the property of his master. Other forms of property, at first, could be disposed of as the owner chose—he had the power of disinheriting his

Communist Manifesto (London, Martin Lawrence), pp. 187-88: "The fifth demand recalls one of the leading proposals of the Saint Simonians. The champions of this doctrine always stressed the importance of banks and credit institutions. Still, there is really no more than a formal resemblance between the demand voiced in the *Manifesto* and that put forward by the Saint-Simonians. Marx, who had in 1847 unmercifully criticised Proudhon's ideas concerning gratuitous credit and People's Banks, had still less tolerance of the credit and banking illusions of the Saint-Simonians. Just as the People's Banks of Proudhon would have been powerless to do away with the laws governing the production of commodities, just so little would the centralised bank of the Saint-Simonians have proved capable of regulating production in such a way as to avert recurrent crises. In both cases alike, the maintenance of private property in the means of production would have left the laws of capitalist society intact."

family or dividing property among the members of the family in an arbitrary manner. The legislator, later, laid down definite rules according to which property passed to the eldest son, or was divided among the survivors in a prescribed manner. "Today," said Bazard, "a last change has become necessary: it is for the moralist to prepare it ; later it will be for the legislator to prescribe it. The law of progress which we have observed tends to establish an order of things in which the State, and no longer the family, will inherit all accumulated wealth, in so far as it forms what economists call instruments of production (*le fonds de production*)" ³⁷.

Transferring to the State as an association of workers (*Association des travailleurs*) ³⁸ the right to inherit capital goods or means of production means the abolition of the right of the family to inherit them. "The sole right to wealth, that is to say, to dispose over instruments of labour," says Bazard, "will be the capacity of using them" ³⁹.

Only those who are able to show that they are fit to use capital goods will have property. The privilege of birth completely disappears.

But it would seem as if private property in capital goods had been retained—only the ownership had changed hands, or property had been transferred from incapable to capable owners. That would still be a gain, but it is not the same thing as centralization of means of production in the hands of a planning authority.

Let us follow Bazard further :—

"We say that in future the sole claim to property

³⁷ Bazard, p. 248.

³⁸ Ibid. p. 253.

³⁹ Ibid. p. 254.

will be the capacity for peaceful labour ; the sole claim to consideration, work ; we shall add, for the sake of precision, that this title shall be direct for each owner ⁴⁰, which implicitly includes this other idea that the only right conferred by the title of owner is that of direction, use and exploitation of property ” ⁴¹.

It deserves to be emphasized that the owner of property in the system of Bazard is an owner in name only, since ownership only means the right of ‘ direction, use and exploitation of property.’ Bazard makes this point clearer in another passage :

“ Every one is paid according to his function ; what one at present calls profit is only a salary or a pension. An industrialist does not possess a workshop, workmen, instruments, in any other sense than that in which a colonel at present possesses barracks, soldiers, arms ; and still all work with enthusiasm, because one who produces can love glory, can have [a sense of] honour, as much as the one who destroys [*i. e.*, the soldier] ” ⁴².

Does a colonel own barracks, soldiers, guns and ammunition ? No, he makes use of them under the direction or orders of the general. Such would be the position of owners in Bazard’s society of the future. Means of production are placed at their disposal. They use them as directed by a central authority. What they earn is a reward for their services, a salary or a pension. Ownership, as ownership is understood, melts away.

Let us follow Bazard again :—

“ Let us transport ourselves to the new world. There

⁴⁰ Direct in the sense that the right will be derived from the performance of a duty, or a social function. ⁴¹ Bazard, p. 255.

⁴² *Ibid.* p. 275.

are no longer separate landlords and capitalists, unaccustomed by habit to industrial labours, who determine the choice of undertakings, the fate of workers. A social institution is invested with these functions, so ill-performed today ; it is the *depositaire* of all instruments of production ; it directs all material exploitation ; in consequence of this it is placed where it can view things as a whole, which permits it to see at once all parts of the industrial workshop (*atelier*) ; through its branches it is in contact with all localities, with all industrialists (*genres d'industrie*), with all workers ; it can thus take account of general and individual requirements, furnish support and instruments where need for them is felt, in a word, direct production, bring it in harmony with consumption, and entrust instruments of production to the industrialists who are most worthy, because it ceaselessly endeavours to know their capacities and is in the best position to develop them " 43.

If such an institution is brought into existence and if it works in the manner described above, disorder ends :
 " In a word, industry is organized, all is controlled, all is foreseen, the division of labour is perfected, the combination of efforts becomes increasingly powerful daily." 44.

It must be admitted that Bazard is thinking of organizing the entire productive forces of society ; it is not merely a question of abolishing the right of inheritance in means of production. He is thinking in terms of the Gosplan. At the head of the social body there stand directors, men possessing general ability, who tell every one what he or she shall do, who direct the investment of

43 Bazard, p. 261. 44 Ibid, p. 261.

capital in particular employments, and its withdrawal from others, and guide the whole course of economic activity. Bazard even talks of a budget of entire industry :

“ In the system of industrial organization which we have just sketched, the assets side of the budget is the totality of the annual products of industry ; the liabilities side is the division of all these products among secondary banks, each of the latter preparing its own budget in the same manner ” ⁴⁵.

The reader may be reminded of the budget of the Soviet Government. It is very unlike the budgets of capitalist Governments. The Government of India budget, for example, is a budget of Government income and expenditure, not a budget of the total income of the country, including agriculture and industries, or total expenditure including capital investment for productive purposes. Only those enterprises are included in the Indian budget in which the Government have a direct interest (*e.g.*, railways, posts and telegraphs). In the Soviet budget expounded by M. Grinko (of blessed memory) in *Soviet Union 1936* profits of industry are shown on the revenue and capital investment on the expenditure side. M. Grinko referred with pride to the growth of profits of socialized economy from 7,300 million rubles in 1933 to 11,300 million rubles in 1936. Of the total sum of 28,700 million rubles required for financing capital development in 1936, the budget provided 17,900 million rubles, the rest being found by local budgets, the business organizations themselves and from other sources. The Soviet

⁴⁵ Bazard, p. 274.

MARXISM IS DEAD

budget is not prepared by the Commissar of Finance alone. It is really the work of the Gosplan. The central Gosplan is assisted by local Gosplans and a numerous technical staff.

The Gosplan may be said to have realized the ideal of Bazard. In Soviet economy it takes the place of the 'social institution' of Bazard. It decides what shall be produced, in what quantities, and where. It estimates the requirements of the different branches of Soviet economy. At its direction credit flows to certain branches and is withdrawn from others. The Gosplan is ultimately responsible for equating supply and demand. Further, directly or indirectly, the Gosplan assigns to each worker his place in the Soviet economy. Substitute 'Gosplan' for the 'social institution' in Bazard's account of his *monde nouveau* (new world), and Bazard, by a remarkable feat of clairvoyance, is describing the organization of production in the Soviet Union.

Can the system of Bazard be described as socialism? Not, if the reader is inclined to quarrel about words. Bazard does not make the State 'owner' of instruments of production in so many words but *depositaire* or trustee. But whether the State owns all instruments of production, or takes charge of them as a trustee and distributes them among workers, the result is the same. After all, what does State ownership of land and capital mean in the Soviet Union? The State has handed over land to associated groups of peasants for perpetual use, that is for ever ⁴⁶. Factories and tools and appliances are owned

⁴⁶ Each collective farm household has for its own use a plot of land attached to the house, and as individual property, an auxiliary establishment on the plot, the house, produce animals and poultry and

by the State, but used by associated groups of workers working under the direction of a chief. So would property be used in Bazardian economy—ownership, as we have seen, is the right of using property, nothing more, and profit, a salary or a pension.

The system of Bazard is socialism, the genuine article. It is socialism which owes nothing to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Posterity has treated Bazard unfairly. Marx undoubtedly borrowed from Bazard, but he does not mention him. Marxists never name him. He has no place in the *Encyclopædia of Labour*. He is noticed by Karl Diehl in the monumental *Handwoerterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, and also in his work *Ueber Sozialismus, Kommunismus und Anarchismus* ⁴⁷, but even Diehl dismisses him in a page.

The Marxists would perhaps say : “ Admitting for the sake of argument that Bazard’s system is socialism, is it ‘ scientific ’ socialism ? ” No, that it is not. First, Bazard

minor agricultural implements. The law allows small private farms and other enterprises of individual peasants and house workers based on their personal labour and precluding the exploitation of the labour of others (Articles 7-9 of the Soviet Constitution).

Article 12 declares :—“ In the U. S. S. R. work is the duty of every able-bodied citizen, according to the principle ‘ He who does not work, neither shall he eat,’

“ In the U. S. S. R. the principle of socialism is realised : ‘ From each according to his ability, to each according to his work ’.”

Bazard’s whole idea in abolishing the right of inheritance in means of production is to do away with idlers who live on the fruits of others’ toil. He would also make every one work and reward every one according to his work. See below note 48.

47. 4th edition Jena, Gustav Fischer, 1922. See pp. 184-85. The summary of Bazard’s position given by Diehl is all too brief. He recognises that the disciples of St. Simon, particularly Bazard and Enfantin, “ went far beyond their master ” (*gingen weit ueber ihren Meister hinaus*).

does not reach his conception of property, or of society as an "Association of Workers" through negation of the negation, or dialectical materialism. Second, his socialism is socialism in one country; Bazard talks vaguely of unity and goodwill among the nations, as any religious enthusiast may talk of the Brotherhood of Man and Fatherhood of God, but he does not call upon the proletarians of the world to unite to throw off the yoke of the world bourgeoisie and to establish a world society. Third, he does not make the State dissolve of itself and go, or 'wither away.' Fourth, he is not a communist, he expressly repudiates communism⁴⁸. And fifth, he is a man of peace, and would seek to attain his end through peaceful persuasion and evolution, though he realizes that the changes he

48 "We may anticipate that some people will confuse this system with what is known by the name of *community of goods* (communism). There is, however, no relation between the two. In the social organization of the future every one, we have said, will be graded according to his capacity, and rewarded according to his works; this sufficiently indicates inequality in distribution. In the system of community, on the contrary, all parts are equal, and against this method of distribution many objections may necessarily be raised. When the idler is as well rewarded as the man who works, the principle of emulation is abolished, and consequently the latter finds the whole burden of the community falling on himself. This will suffice to show that such distribution is contrary to the principle of equality which is invoked for establishing it. Besides, in this system, equilibrium would be constantly upset, inequality would incessantly tend to be re-established, which would constantly necessitate a new distribution.

"These objections are well founded and cannot be met when they attack the system of community of goods, but they are without weight if urged against the principle of classification and rewards according to capacities and works, the principle which we believe is destined to rule the future." Bazard, pp. 248-49. The Soviet principle of distribution is the same. One does not know whether Bazard would have favoured progressive piece-rates.

would bring about are revolutionary ⁴⁹.

No, Bazard is not a 'scientific' socialist. And since all socialism that is not 'scientific' is utopian, we may call Bazard's system a 'utopia.' Here, then, we may leave Bazard's utopia, to busy ourselves with what, according to the devout followers of Marx, is the only socialism worthy of acceptance, or the 'scientific' socialism of Marx and Engels.

49 "The doctrine of St. Simon, like all new general doctrines, assuredly does not propose to conserve what exists, or only to change it superficially; its object is to profoundly, radically change the system of sentiments, of ideas and of interests; and still it does not come to subvert society. To the word *bouleversement* (subversion) attaches the idea of a force blind and brutal having destruction as its object, its result: now these characters are very far from being those of the doctrine of Saint Simon. For the direction of people this doctrine possesses in itself and recognizes no other force than that of persuasion, of conviction; its aim is to construct and not to destroy; it has always order, harmony and construction in view, whether it produces an idea of a purely speculative value, or whether it invokes the material realization which this idea tends to determine. The doctrine of St. Simon, we repeat, does not wish to bring about a convulsion, a revolution; it is a transformation, an evolution which it has come to foretell and to accomplish; it is a new education, a final regeneration which it brings to the world." Bazard, pp. 278-79.

"Disgusting," I hear the communist, the follower of Marx, exclaim. But what else can one expect from utopians, dreamers and visionaries?

Bazard does not propose to cut the throats of the bourgeoisie. He would make the bourgeois work for a living. Answering a childish objection that every one could not be made to work because society included children and old men, he said that in times of distress old men and children perished because a considerable body of strong, young and intelligent men were always consuming, and a great deal, and producing nothing. "It is to these latter that we promise, in the future, a noble exercise of their sentiments, of their intelligence, of their vigour" In the society of the future there would not be seen bands of young sluggards flitting on the promenades and in the salons; "but those who today live on the sweat of the old, on the tears of orphans, will produce bread for children and old men." Bazard, p. 255n. Thus no blood-curdling threats of revolution and destruction of the bourgeoisie, but its evolution, through persuasion, through peaceful non-violent action, into a useful, productive class.

CHAPTER II

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

The title of this book *Marxism is Dead* will enrage good Marxists. "Is Marxism dead? Emphatically not," the Marxist will say. "Marxism is very much alive. It has won its greatest triumph in Marxist Russia, and it is going to conquer the whole world."

In support of their view Marxists may now quote a prominent man of science and a Fellow of the Royal Society, J. B. S. Haldane. In 1938 he delivered a series of lectures at Birmingham which have been published. Haldane has revealed his reasons for delivering these lectures: "I think that Marxism is true."¹

What does Haldane mean by Marxism, and in what sense is Marxism 'alive and growing'?

What interests us in Marxism is Marx's criticism of capitalist society, or the application of Marxist principles in the economic sphere. Marx believed in the inevitable transformation of capitalism into communism. Haldane deals with Marxism but 'mainly outside the economic field.'² He is not an economist, but a brilliant man of science.

That Marxism is 'alive and growing,' and not dead,

¹ *The Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences*, by J. B. S. Haldane, F. R. S. (London, George Allen and Unwin), p. 16.

² *Ibid.* p. 23.

applies, in Haldane's book, chiefly to Marx's 'method,'³ particularly in the domain of the exact sciences. To speak on this subject Haldane's authority is unquestioned.

Now economics is not an exact science. Marx's method may be of the greatest utility in physical science, and yet it may yield results of little or no value in economics. Assuming that Marxism is true as a method in one field of enquiry, it does not follow that it is equally true in a totally different field of investigation where law, or the relation of cause and effect, has not the same connotation.

But an economist, who is not a Marxist, has written in praise of Marx's method⁴. This is G. D. H. Cole. It is not

3 Haldane, p. 17. Haldane says: "Marxism is not complete, not a system, and only in the second place theoretical. It is not complete because it is alive and growing, and above all because it lays no claim to finality. The most that a Marxist can say for Marxism is that it is the best and truest philosophy that could have been produced under the social conditions of the mid-nineteenth century. It is not primarily a system, but a method."

4 Cole says in *What Marx Really Meant*, pp. 9-10, "Our world is continuous with his; and to some extent he was able to foresee aright how the one would develop out of the other.

"That is why, if Marx helps us at all, his method is likely to help us more than his conclusions. For a method of study and analysis is likely to remain valid for longer than any set of conclusions arrived at by its use. This is not to say that method can remain static in a changing world; but it is reasonable to suppose that the general forms of thought will change more slowly than their particular content.

"Of course, it is possible that Marx's method will not help us. There are, I know, some Marxists who hold his method to have been an unfortunate philosophical aberration, in despite of which he hit on a number of important truths. But these are either the parrots of Marxism, who learn diligently without reflection, or its mere hangers-on, in search of comfortable crumbs of congenial doctrine. Marx's method is integral, not only to his conclusions, but to the entire basis of historical study on which his conclusions rest. His method will fail to help us only if his whole analysis was from beginning to end upon the wrong lines."

possible for us to ignore 'the wonderful Marxian method.'

In our analysis of the Marxian method, dialectical materialism, we may follow Haldane.

This method means in the first place the unity of theory and practice, with the primacy of practice. This may be connected with the second principle of Marxism, which is materialism. Practice is more important than theory because Marxism takes a realistic view of the universe. Marxism 'insists on the priority of matter,' and therefore "Marxists must on occasion deal very vigorously with idealists." ⁵ Dialectical materialism, as applied to history, becomes historical materialism. Dialectical materialism is founded on Hegelian dialectic, but Hegel, being an idealist, saw everything upside down. "Hegel is standing on his head, our business is to put him on his feet." ⁶ Marx did so.

Materialism in India is a very old thing. A hundred Hegels, standing on their heads, were put on their feet in India many centuries before Marx, by the *Samkhya* system. ⁷

Haldane next proceeds to explain the dialectical principles. First is the principle of the unity of opposites. The wood of a table is both hard and soft, hard in the sense that it can support things, and soft in the sense that it can be cut. It is thus shown that matter unites opposite qualities.

⁵ Haldane, *loc. cit.*, p. 26. ⁶ Ibid. p. 29. ⁷ Sir Radha Krishnan in his account of the *Samkhya* system (*Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 278) says: "The world is neither real nor unreal. It is not unreal, like a man's horn, nor real, since it passes away. It is not, however, to be regarded as indescribable, since such a thing cannot exist. The *Samkhya* repudiates the view that records the world as a reflection of what is not, nor is the world a mere idea. The world exists in its eternal form of *prakṛti* and passes away in its transitory manifestations. The world has phenomenal reality as undergoing transformations."

This is not a startlingly new discovery. The unity of opposites in matter was known to our ancient philosophers. One or two examples may be given.

Samkhya Karika XIII describes the action of the three *gunas* or qualities, *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* 'like a lamp' (*pradipvat*). *Sattva* was conceived as buoyant and illuminating, *Rajas* as exciting and mobile, and *Tamas* as sluggish and enveloping. Vachaspati Misra explains how, while these *gunas* are mutually contradictory (*parasparavirodhshilah gunah*), their functioning is for a single purpose. In a lamp the wick and the oil are each opposed to the action of fire. But, when in contact with fire, they combine to produce light.⁸

Take another example. The same woman, young, beautiful and virtuous is *sukhrup* or a source of happiness to her husband, *dukhrup* or a source of pain to her co-wives, and *mohrup*, or a source of delusion to other men.

The second principle is the passage of quantity into quality. "In modern physics," says Haldane, "it is familiar under the name of quantization. Not only mass, but energy can only be transferred from one system to another (at least in certain cases) in definite quantities."⁹

Marx gives a characteristic example of the passage of quantity into quality. This is the transformation of money into capital, which we shall examine later. The examples given by Engels may be considered here.

Water, under normal atmospheric pressure, changes at zero degree centigrade from the liquid into the solid state, and at 100 degrees centigrade from the liquid into the

8 *The Tattva Kaumudi*, Trs. by Ganga Nath Jha, Poona (The Oriental Book Society), 1934, p. 49.

9 Haldane, p. 32.

gaseous state, "so that at both these turning points the merely quantitative change of temperature brings about a qualitative change in the condition of the water."¹⁰

Or consider the effects of a number of people working together : "the co-operation of a number of people, the fusion of many forces into one single force, to use Marx's phrase, creates a 'new power', which is essentially different from the sum of its individual powers."¹¹

Engels finally calls Napoleon as a witness for the transformation of quantity into quality. Referring to the Mamelukes, who were good horsemen for single combat but lacked discipline, Napoleon had said : "Two Mamelukes were undoubtedly more than a match for three Frenchmen : 100 Mamelukes were equal to 100 Frenchmen; 300 Frenchmen could generally beat 300 Mamelukes, and 1,000 Frenchmen invariably defeated 1,500 Mamelukes."¹² It is obvious that in the case of the Frenchmen, increase of numbers brought a 'new power' into existence, or there was a transformation of quantity into quality.

If this is the whole content of quantum mechanics associated with the name of Max Planck, then quantum mechanics was known to Marx and Engels long before Planck !

Was quantum mechanics known to Vachaspati Misra or to the founders of the *Samkhya* school in the pre-Christian era ? I doubt it. They knew that a 'new power' was produced by the co-operation of a number of people, but they thought that the 'new power' was an

¹⁰ *Anti-Duhring*, p. 144. ¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 144.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 146.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY effect which was already contained in the cause. Why? An aphorism of Kapila (Book I, 114) says : ‘ The production of what is no entity, as a man’s horn, does not take place ’ (*Nasadutpado nrishringvat*). A commentator explains that that effect alone which antecedently exists is at any time produced.

And yet the *Samkhya* philosophers knew that a combination produced new qualities, or quantity passed into quality. Yarns severally, says Vāchaspati Misra, do not serve the purpose of covering, but they serve that purpose ‘on combining and appearing in the form of cloth.’ Again : “Each individual bearer performs the function of indicating the path, but not that of carrying the palanquin, while collectively they carry the palanquin.”¹²

I am not quite satisfied that these illustrations contain the idea of quantum mechanics. Whether those given by Marx and Engels do, I leave it to physicists to judge.

Dialectical materialism inspired Lenin to write ‘ a year or two before the publication of Einstein’s first theory of relativity : ’

“ Human conceptions of space and time are relative, but on the basis of these relative conceptions we arrive at absolute truth. These relative conceptions in their development follow the line of absolute truth and continually approach it. The mutability of human ideas in regard to space and time no more refutes the objective reality of either than the mutability of scientific knowledge concerning the structure and forms of matter in motion refutes the objective reality of the outer world.”

This passage is considered so important by Haldane

¹² *The Tattva Kaumudi*, p. 38.

that he reproduces it twice in the same chapter.¹³

It appears that from the point of view of Marxist philosophy space and time are regarded as real.

Haldane's own view of space and time is quoted below :

"Space is real as the system of relationships between material objects and events. But it has no absolute existence apart from matter, and a belief in its existence apart from matter is a step away from materialism towards metaphysics. So with time.

"The order of events in time within a given material system is an objective fact. The scale on which they are to be measured is a matter of convenience."¹⁴

This is the verdict of a man of science, based on scientific investigation, or observation and experiments made with delicate instruments of great precision.

Now in ancient India space and time formed the subject of metaphysical speculation, and our philosophers arrived at certain conclusions which seem to be not dissimilar.

Keith notes that according to *Samkhya* "space and time are only specifications of material things and do not exist outside matter."¹⁵

In the Vaiseshika system of Kanada, time and space are included in substances along with water, fire, air, ether, etc. This seems remarkable, but Garbe explains that Kanada's view of 'substance' was more comprehensive than that in Western philosophy.¹⁶

¹³ Haldane, pp 56 and 60.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 67. ¹⁵ *The Samkhya System*, by A. Berriedale Keith, Oxford University Press, 1924, p. 38.

¹⁶ *Die Samkhya Philosophie*, by Richard Garbe, Leipzig, 1917, p. 167.

There is no doubt at all that time and space were regarded as real by certain schools of Indian philosophy. Of course time, *Kala*, is not an object of *pratyaksha* (perception) 'like a pot,' etc. In this sense *Kala* is not an entity. But it is an 'auxiliary of motion.'¹⁷

Space, similarly, is viewed as real, but not as an object of visual direct perception. It is taken as 'the substratum of a movement' in the sense in which a jar is said to be the substratum of curd or the forest of the roaring lion.¹⁸

The illustrations are curious, but their meaning is plain. Space and time are real in the sense that they are conditions for the appearance of phenomena.

These references to ancient conceptions were not out of place. Ancient India produced many brilliant dialecticians, and the dialectic of *Samkhya* particularly was wholly materialist.

It is worth noting that the *Samkhya* evolves the whole universe from the unity of opposites, the three qualities of *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. The unity of opposites may in fact be regarded as the corner-stone of the *Samkhya* universe.

Secondly, *Samkhya's* universe is real. As Garbe has pointed out, in *Samkhya* the perception of an object by an observer of normal or healthy senses is a proof of the reality of the object.¹⁹ The reality of the universe is clearly and specifically asserted in several *Samkhya Sutras*.²⁰ Attention may be drawn particularly to aphorism 42 of

17 *Conception of Matter According to Nyaya Vaisheshika*, by Umesha Mishra, Allahabad, 1936, p. 179. 18 *Ibid.* p. 192.

19 Garbe, loc. cit. p. 265. 20 See *Sutras* I, 79 and V, 52.

Book I, to show that *Samkhya* philosophers did not stand on their heads but firmly on their feet :

“ *Na vijñān matram bahiyem pratīteh.*”

(“Not thought alone exists; because there is the intuition of the external”).

And the *Samkhya* dialecticians had effective arguments to meet those who argued that the universe might be unreal like dream figures.

Thirdly, while viewing the universe as real, the *Samkhya* philosophers do not attribute it to a sentient Being, or God. The universe has evolved of itself from the operation of cause and effect. Their point of view is essentially evolutionary. God has no place in *Samkhya's* evolution; Nature acts ‘as insentient milk flows out for the growth of the calf.’²¹ If it is held that the flow of milk to nourish the calf is due to the superintending care of God, the *Samkhya* philosophers would want to know the reasons which led God to create the universe. God surely had all that He required; no selfish motives account for creation. If it is suggested that the universe was created by motives of pity or benevolence, then God would be expected to create only happy mortals, and it is undeniable that all mortals are not happy—most of them in fact are definitely unhappy.

Garbe includes denial of God (*die Gottes Leugnung*) among the characteristic doctrines of *Samkhya*.²²

If, as *Samkhya* philosophers argue, there is no God, and if the world of objects is real, and if everything has evolved through cause and effect, and if different com-

²¹ *Samkhya Karika*, LVII. Vachaspati Misra, loc. cit. pp. 119-20. ²² Garbe loc. cit. p. 26.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY
binations of opposite qualities account for all that exists, the *Samkhya* system may be aptly described as dialectical materialism.

But there is a world of difference between this dialectical materialism and the method of science. A scientist needs imagination, but he relies on measurements.²³ Now Marx, Engels and Lenin measured nothing to arrive at their conception of the physical universe. Their speculations regarding the passage of quantity into quality or the nature of time and space, have as little to do with genuine science as those of ancient Indian philosophers.

CONVERSION OF MONEY INTO CAPITAL

We are really not concerned with the change of quantity into quality in physical science, but with the application of this dialectical principle in economic relations. Let us consider how money is converted into capital.

Assume with Marx that the value of a day's labour power is three shillings, and that this sum incorporates six hours' labour. The value in money of 10 lbs. of cotton is 10s. and the wear and tear of spinning machinery which converts this cotton into yarn is equal to 2s. Fifteen shillings is an 'adequate price' for the 10 lbs. of yarn. No surplus value has been produced, and so far there is no conversion of money into capital.

Then our capitalist, who is a cunning rascal, buys 20 lbs. of cotton which are converted into yarn in 12 hours by the same labourer. The value of the yarn is 30s., representating 5 days' labour. But the capitalist has spent

²³ See "*Where is Science Going*," by Max Planck (London, George Allen and Unwin), Chapter III.

only 27s., that is, he pays the labourer the same 3s., as before, retaining 3s. for himself. Marx says :

"The value of the yarn is 30 shillings. Therefore the value of the product is $1/9$ greater than the value advanced for its production ; 27 shillings have been transformed into 30 shillings ; a surplus value of 3 shillings has been created. The trick has at last succeeded ; money has been converted into capital." ²⁴

Here is one example of the passage of quantity into quality. When the capitalist advanced only 15s. money remained money ; when he advances 27s., the 27s. are immediately converted into capital.

By his trick the capitalist has gained 3 shillings only, a sum which would enable him to live for a day like the labourer he employs. If he wants more, he must employ more labourers, for the amount of surplus value depends on the number of labourers employed. ²⁵

Suppose the capitalist wants to live twice as well as an ordinary labourer and also to turn half of the surplus value produced into capital. Then, assuming as before that the degree of exploitation of labour-power is 100

²⁴ *Capital*, Vol. I (Kerr ed.), p. 217.

²⁵ *Capital*, Vol. I (Kerr ed.), p. 334.

"A third law results from the determination, of the mass of the surplus-value produced, by the two factors : rate of surplus value and amount of variable capital advanced. The rate of surplus value, or the degree of exploitation of labour-power, and the value of labour-power, or the amount of necessary working time being given, it is self-evident that the greater the variable capital, the greater would be the mass of the value produced and of the surplus-value. If the limit of the working day is given, and also the limit of its necessary constituent, the mass of value and surplus-value that an individual capitalist produces is clearly exclusively dependent on the mass of labour that he sets in motion."

per cent (or that the labourer works during 6 hours for himself, and during the remaining 6 hours for the capitalist) the capitalist must advance four times as much capital as before and employ four labourers. Four labourers, working 12 hours a day, would convert 80 lbs. of cotton into yarn. The price of cotton is 80 shillings, wear and tear of machinery is represented by 16 shillings, and the value of labour-power by 24 shillings. The value of yarn is thus 120 shillings. But since the degree of exploitation of labour is 100 per cent, the four labourers are paid in all 12 shillings. The total sum spent by the capitalist is 108 shillings, which is four times greater than the sum advanced by him when he employed a single labourer, and gained 3s. of surplus value. He can now spend 6s. on himself, or live twice as well as the labourer, and turn half of the total surplus value produced or 12s. into capital.

If the degree of exploitation of labour was only 50 per cent, that is if the labourer worked for 8 hours for himself, and for 4 hours for the capitalist, his wages would amount to 4s., and surplus value produced during 12 hours to 2s. To live twice as well as the labourer and to turn half of surplus value into capital, the capitalist would have to gain 16 shillings. For that purpose he would have to buy 160 lbs. of cotton, incur a cost of 32s. on account of wear and tear of machinery and pay 32 shillings as wages to 8 labourers. The value of labour power is however 48 shillings. The total value of yarn produced is $48 + 32 + 160$ or 240 shillings, but the sum advanced by the capitalist is 224 shillings, 16 shillings being left as surplus value.

In the present example 8 shillings of surplus value are

turned into capital. If we like we may say that the employer turns into a capitalist only when he gains in surplus value a sum which is in excess of what he requires for his own consumption. That seems to be Marx's meaning on p. 337 (Kerr edition)*. But on a previous page the conversion of money into capital, or the passage of quantity into quality, takes place as soon as the employer gains a surplus value of 3 shillings, equal to the wages paid.

It would be obviously useless to quarrel about the exact magnitude of the sum that the capitalist must advance in order to turn money into capital. Conceivably the capitalist may decide to live miserably. Having cheated the labourer of 3 shillings, he may live on 2 shillings, and invest 1 shilling of surplus value in capital goods. Money is thus turned into capital as soon as 3 shillings of surplus value arise.

The argument of Engels on this point is reproduced below.²⁶ It would seem, according to Engels, that an

**Capital*, Vol. I (Kerr ed.), p. 337. "A certain stage of capitalist production necessitates that the capitalist be able to devote the whole of the time during which he functions as a capitalist, *i.e.*, as personified capital, to the appropriation and therefore control of the labour of others, and to the selling of the products of this labour. The guilds of the middle-ages therefore tried to prevent by force the transformation of the master of a trade into a capitalist, by limiting the number of labourers that could be employed by one master within a very small maximum. The possessor of money or commodities actually turns into a capitalist in such cases only where the minimum sum advanced for production greatly exceeds the maximum of the middle-ages. Here, as in natural science, is shown the correctness of the law discovered by Hegel (in his *Logic*), that merely quantitative differences beyond a certain point pass into qualitative changes."

²⁶ *Anti-Duehring*, pp. 142-43; "He then takes as an example the case of a labourer in any branch of industry, who works eight hours for himself—that is, in producing the value of his wages—and

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

employer with two labourers is not a capitalist, although he can live on the surplus value produced as well as one of his labourers. It follows then that the passage of quantity into quality in the case of money partly depends on the employer's style of living. If he lives poorly, even like his labourers, or worse, money is turned into capital almost as soon as he pockets any surplus value at all. If he prefers to live like a prince, spending on himself all the surplus value of a hundred labourers or more, there is no passage of quantity into quality !

What is the scientific value of such vague notions of the passage of quantity into quality? The whole argument is ridiculous. In fact, it is no argument at all, but propaganda. There is not the slightest, remotest connection between this supposed transformation of quantity into quality and the radiation of light waves from a heated body which, according to the quantum theory, takes place

the following four hours for the capitalist, in producing surplus value, which immediately flows into the pocket of the capitalist. In this case a capitalist would have to dispose of a sum of value sufficient to enable him to provide two labourers with raw materials, instruments of labour, and wages in order to appropriate enough surplus value every day to enable him to live on it even as well as one of his labourers. And as the aim of capitalist production is not mere subsistence but the increase of wealth, our man with his two labourers would still not be a capitalist. Now in order that he may live twice as well as an ordinary labourer, and besides turn half of the surplus value produced again into capital, he would have to be able to employ eight labourers, that is, he would have to dispose of four times the sum of value assumed above. And it is only after this, and in the course of still further explanations elucidating and establishing the fact that not every petty sum of value is enough to be transformable into capital, but that the minimum sum required varies with each period of development and each branch of industry, it is only then that Marx observes: 'Here, as in natural science, is verified the correctness of the law discovered by Hegel (in his *Logic*) that merely quantitative changes beyond a certain point pass into qualitative differences.'

not continuously but in little 'jerks.' It is well for Haldane's Marxist faith that he is not an economist.

Whether money is money or capital depends not on its quantity but the use that is made of it.

Wealth devoted to consumption is not capital. Money, representatively, is wealth. The sum spent on entertaining friends and relations on the occasion of a marriage or other ceremony is wealth used unproductively. This money will always remain money, whether the cost of the entertainment is five rupees or five thousand or five lakhs of rupees. There is no transformation of money into capital with increase in its magnitude so long as money is used unproductively, or there is no passage of quantity into quality.

But money may be used productively. With five rupees I buy a *charkha* and start spinning. At the end of the day I have earned 1 anna. My five rupees were capital ; the *charkha* is capital.

All wealth used productively is capital. Nothing depends on magnitude—it is the use of wealth that matters. The needle and thread of the tailor are capital, as also the expensive plant used in the manufacture of steel products. A community's capital consists in its whole apparatus of production, including all goods that are in the main used indirectly. Another term for capital is producers' goods.

Marx's definition of capital is propagandist, not scientific. Capital, according to Marx, is that sum of money which is used to exploit labour, or for the production of surplus value. Where there is no surplus value, money, though it has set labour in motion, has not yet been transformed into capital. As soon as the capitalist makes

3 shillings at the expense of the labourer, the trick is successful and money is turned into capital. By employing more labourers more surplus value is produced, and the capitalist may add to his capital.

Marx's whole theory of exploitation is wrong.

Marx seemed to believe in the iron law of wages. He recognised that a historical and moral element entered into the determination of labour-power. "Nevertheless," he wrote, "in a given country at a given period, the average quantity of the means of subsistence necessary for the labourer is practically known." Wages are equal to the means of subsistence.²⁷

It is undoubtedly true that about a hundred years ago, the average British worker did not receive as wages much more than the means of subsistence necessary for his maintenance. Facts seemed to confirm the iron law of wages. But where is the economist, or any one else who

27 That clearly is Marx's meaning. On p. 212, *Capital*, Vol. I. (Kerr ed.), Marx assumes that the value of labour-power is 3s., incorporating 6 hours' labour. It follows that "this amount of labour is requisite to produce the necessaries of life daily required on an average by the labourer." On a preceding page, Marx says: "The value of labour-power is determined, as in the case of every other commodity, by the labour-time necessary for the production, and consequently also the reproduction of this special article. So far as it has value, it represents no more than a definite quantity of the average labour of society incorporated in it. Labour-power exists only as a capacity, or power of the living individual. Its production consequently presupposes his existence. Given the individual, the production of labour-power consists in his reproduction of himself or his maintenance. For his maintenance he requires a given quantity of the means of subsistence. Therefore the labour-time requisite for the production of labour-power reduces itself to that necessary for the production of those means of subsistence; in other words, the value of labour-power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of the labourer." (*Capital*, Kerr ed., pp. 189-90.)

can assert today that the wages of the average worker in England or America are determined by the means of subsistence necessary for his maintenance? In India the average unskilled worker is paid wages which are less than his subsistence. There is no law which makes wages equal to the subsistence of the worker.

This is a point of some importance, for the wages paid are used by Marx as the basis for the computation of surplus value. The degree of exploitation of labour is 100 per cent when the value created by labour-power is 6s., and the wages paid 3s. To determine the degree of exploitation we must know the wages paid. Now if our conception of wages were elastic, that is, if wages were determined by the productivity of labour, exploitation would lose some of its rigidity. Its degree cannot be fixed if wages are not fixed, invariable amount equal to the means of subsistence.

In the second place the 'great contradiction' to which attention was drawn in *Indian Socialism* remains unsolved.

Of course Marx solved it, to his own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of Marxists who cannot think for themselves. And it appears that he did so, not only in Vol. III of *Capital*, but in letters written in 1861 and 1868. Bourgeois economists who attempted to manufacture a contradiction between the first and third volumes of capital stand thoroughly exposed.²⁸

The argument on this point in Marx's letter to Engels dated 9th December, 1861, and a second letter dated

²⁸ Marx-Engels *Selected Correspondence* (London, Lawrence and Wishart,) p. 133, Translator's note.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

30th April, 1868, is substantially the same as that given in Vol. III. As the result of competition equal sums of capital in different trades, despite their different organic composition, yield the same average rate of profit. The illustration used in the earlier letter is reproduced below :—

	<i>Value of the product</i>	<i>Profit per cent</i>	
(1) c 80, v 20	110	10	Rate of surplus value in all cases =50 per cent.
(2) c 50, v 50	125	25	
(3) c 70, v 30	115	15	
(4) c 90, v 10	105	5	
<hr/> Capital		400	Profit = 55

In the case of industry (2) the rate of profit is highest, 25 per cent on the capital advanced; the technical composition of capital is also lowest in this case, variable capital (v, or wages) being equal to the constant capital, or c. The value of the product is 125 because surplus value is half of the wages paid, the degree of exploitation of labour being 50 per cent. Had the degree of exploitation been 100 per cent, the value of the product would have been 150, and the rate of profit 50 per cent. It is seen that the rate of profit varies according to the technical composition of capital in these four industries. But taking the four capitals together, a profit of 55 is earned on 400, or the rate of profit is $13\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.

“ Regarded as the total capital of the class (400) the

rate of profit would be $=13\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. And capitalists are brothers."²⁹

This division of surplus value among brother capitalists at the same average rate of profits is 'capitalist communism,'³⁰ an exceedingly happy term. These wretched capitalists are enemies of communism when it is a question of equal division of all wealth among the members of a society; but they act like good communists in the appropriation of surplus value!

No fresh light has been thrown on this problem, so far as I am aware, by any writer. Communists generally repeat Marx's argument with little or no variation. Even the great Lenin had nothing new to say.³¹ And

29 *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence*, p. 131. 30 Ibid. p. 243: "It next follows that the rate of surplus value (the exploitation of labour being assumed as equal) the production of value and therefore the production of surplus value and therefore the rate of profit, are different in different branches of production. But out of these different rates of profit a mean or general rate of profit is formed by competition. This rate of profit, expressed absolutely, can be nothing else than the surplus value produced (annually) by the capitalist class in relation to the total social capital advanced. For instance, if the social capital $=400c+100v$ and the surplus value annually produced from it $=100sv$, then the composition of the social capital $=80c+20v$ and that of the product (in percentages) $=80c+20v+20sv=20$ per cent rate of profit. This is the general rate of profit,

"What competition is striving to produce between the various masses of capital—differently composed and invested in different spheres of production—is capitalist communism, namely that the mass of capital belonging to each sphere of production should snatch an aliquot part of the total surplus value proportionate to the aliquot part of the total social capital which it forms."

31 Lenin says in *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, pp. 21-22:

"Profit is the ratio between the surplus value and all the capital invested in an undertaking. Capital with a 'high organic composition' (i.e., with a preponderance of constant capital over variable capital to an extent above the social average) yields a less than the average rate of profit; capital with a 'low organic composition' yields a more than the average rate of profit. Competition among the capitalists, who are

to judge from the works of Soviet economists, Soviet students are taught to resolve the 'great contradiction' in orthodox terms of capitalist communism.³²

free to transfer their capital from one branch of production to another, reduces the rate of profit in both cases to the average. The sum total of the values of all the commodities in a given society coincides with the sum total of the prices of all the commodities; but in separate undertakings, and in separate branches of production, as a result of competition commodities are sold, not in accordance with their values, but in accordance with the *prices of production*, which are equal to the expended capital plus the average profit."

32 *Political Economy*, by A. Leontiev, p. 135 :

"Since surplus value is created only by the labour of the workers, enterprises with a low organic composition of capital appear to be the most profitable. But the struggle for profits among the capitalists leads to the equalization of profits with the same amount of capital invested. The ratio of the profits of the capitalist to the amount of capital invested is called the rate of profit. For instance, if by investing a million in an enterprise the capitalist gets profits to the amount of a hundred thousand, his rate of profit is one-tenth, or 10 per cent. Competition among the capitalists leads to the law of the general or average rate of profit. This law, like all the laws of the capitalist system, enforces itself amidst ceaseless fluctuations in the struggle of all against all."

Similar is the argument of another Soviet text book, *An Outline of Political Economy*, by Lapidus and Ostrovityanov (Martin Lawrence, 1929, p. 146 *et seq.*) There is a machine-building factory and a tannery. The variable capital is lower in the former; therefore the machine-constructing capitalist "ought to receive less profit on his capital than does the tanner." Why? Have the joint-authors statistically verified this 'ought'? Not more than Marx, Engels or Lenin. It is assumed that because less human labour is employed, less surplus value is created and the rate of profit is consequently lower (the degree of exploitation of labour is assumed to be the same in the two cases). Tanneries will therefore attract more capital, and capital will tend to be driven out of machine construction. In the end the rate of profit is equalized: "The rate of profit of various spheres of production with differing organic consumption of capital thus strives to find a common level, to reach a certain average rate of profit for the given society." (pp. 147-48). This is Marx, in other words. It does not occur to these Soviet economists that the productivity of labour, the rate of profit, and also wages may be higher in machine-building industries in spite of their higher organic composition of capital—or because of it.

And yet doubts remain. Expression was given to them by W. Gelesnoff in the course of a series of lectures delivered by him in the year 1893 at Kiew. In 1918 Gelesnoff was a professor at Moscow. He may have been 'purged' since then.³³

33 Gelesnoff says: "Profit tends towards an average level while prices are determined by costs of production. Value finds its expression only in the total social products and surplus value in the sum total of profits which flow to the whole capitalist class. The products of particular branches of industry are sold not at their full value but under it (in the case of lower organic composition of capital) or above it (in the case of higher composition of capital), so that profit corresponding to surplus value would be realized only in those exceptional cases in which the composition of capital in given undertakings happened to coincide with the composition of average social capital.

"How this equalization of profits in different spheres of production takes place in spite of differing compositions of capital, to this question Marx gives no clear answer (*Darauf gibt Marx keine klare Antwort*). He simply points out that on account of competition different rates of profit are equalized to an average rate of profit; from which it appears that the competing capitalists act as one body in the distribution of the total surplus value produced by society. Out of the total surplus value each capitalist receives, not a variable portion, but one in proportion to the total capital invested in the undertaking, so that the different capitalists appear 'just like shareholders of a Joint-stock Company, among whom the shares of profits are divided equally.'

"Marx does not investigate how this process of profit-distribution takes place, in which some goods are always sold below and others above their value, but contents himself with giving some passing hints. He points out that capital flows from spheres of production with lower rates of profit into those with higher rates of profit, that the different rates of profit are equalized to a general rate of profit, and, thanks to this constant flow of capital, values are transformed into the prices of goods. The higher the degree of capitalistic development of a country and greater the mobility of capital and labour, the higher will be the degree of equalization of rates of profit.

"Marx made considerable errors in converting values into prices. The thorough examination of this conversion by Tugan-Baranowsky and Bortkiewicz has shown without room for doubt that the Marxian tenet that the total social product received by the entire capitalist class is determined by the total surplus value (that is by the general

The point that I urged in *Indian Socialism* was that there was no pooling of profits as between different countries.³⁴ British and Indian capitalists were definitely not brothers under free trade. There was no capitalist communism embracing both Bombay and Lancashire. The technical composition of our capital was lower, and the degree of exploitation of labour in India was incomparably higher than in England. Was the rate of profit higher in the Bombay industry than in Lancashire? Let any follower of Marx prove it—that would be a brilliant confirmation of the Marxian theory of exploitation, a contribution to thought, and a service to the Cause.

This Indian example is sufficient to demonstrate the falsity of Marx's conclusion that industries with a lower technical composition (or in which the proportion of variable to constant capital is relatively higher) produce more surplus value, and therefore a higher rate of profit than industries with a higher technical composition.³⁵

Instead of different countries we may take two industries in the same country between which there is no

law of value and that of surplus value) simply rests on false assumptions and calculations" (*einfach auf falschen Voraussetzungen und Berechnungen, beruht*). *Grundzuge der Volkswirtschaftslehre*, translated from Russian into German by Dr. E. Altschul, Leipzig, 1918, pp. 236-37. Soviet economists do not so much as refer to this criticism. How could Marx make mistakes?

³⁴ See Chapter I of *Indian Socialism* (Lahore, Atma Ram & Sons, 1937).

³⁵ Marx has said: "If a capital consisting of percentages of $90c + 10v$, produced as much surplus value or profit, with the same degree of exploitation, as a capital consisting of percentages of $10c + 90v$, then it would be plain as daylight that the surplus-value, and value in general, must have an entirely different source than labour, and that political economy would then be without a rational basis." *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 176-77. Kerr ed.

competition, but whose technical composition is different, *e.g.*, agriculture and manufacture. It was Marx himself who said in his letter to Engels, dated 30th April, 1868:—

“Those branches of production which constitute national monopolies are exempted from this equalization process even if their rate of profit is higher than the social rate. This is important later for the development of ground rent.”³⁶

Marx developed this point in Vol. III where he discusses differential and absolute rent. Assuming that the composition of agricultural capital is lower than that of the social average capital, the conclusion follows that “a capital of a certain size in agriculture produces more surplus value, or what amounts to the same, sets in motion and commands more surplus labour (and with it employs more living labour) than a capital of the same size in industry of social average composition.”³⁷

Let us assume, with Marx, that the average composition of non-agricultural capital is $85c + 15v$, and the rate of surplus value 100 per cent. Then the price of production is 115, and 15 per cent is the rate of profit. If the composition of agricultural capital was $75c + 25v$, and the rate of surplus value 100 per cent as in the case of non-agricultural capital, the value of the agricultural product would be 125, and the rate of profit 25 per cent. The rates of profit would be different because there is no equalization of profits in the two cases: “If the agricultural and the non-agricultural product should be levelled to the same average price (we assume for the sake of

36 *Selected Correspondence*, loc. cit., p. 241.

37 Ibid. p. 882.

brevity that the total capital in both lines of production is equal), then the total surplus value would be 40 or 20 per cent upon the 200 of capital. The product of the one as of the other would be sold at 120.”³⁸

It again appears that on account of the lower technical composition of agricultural capital, the rate of profit must be higher in agriculture, given the same rate of exploitation of labour in the two cases.

That we have not misinterpreted Marx is also clear from the summary of Marx's position given by Leontiev. It is clear to Leontiev that agriculture produces more surplus value than industry.³⁹

What are the facts? “Scientific” socialism cannot afford to ignore facts. The method of science is verification. A conclusion may be reached by purely deductive reasoning, but it has no scientific value unless it can stand the test of facts.

It will be admitted that the rate of profit depends on the productiveness of labour. In Marx's account of

38 *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 887.

39 *Political Economy*, by A. Leontiev, pp. 148-49 :—“The land is a monopoly of private owners. This monopoly of land ownership prevents the free transition of capital from industry to agriculture. In order to work the land, the permission of the landowner must be obtained. Technically, agriculture is on a lower level than industry. Therefore the organic composition of capital in agriculture is lower than in industry. This means that with the same capital invested, more surplus value is produced in agriculture than in industry. If there were a free flow of capital between agriculture and industry the rate of profit would be equalized by means of competition. But such freedom does not exist because of the private ownership of land. Hence agricultural products are sold at prices above the price of production. The excess thus obtained goes into the pockets of the landowner and is called absolute ground rent. Marx says that absolute ground rent is tribute paid to the landowner.”

exploitation, particularly, greater productiveness of labour must produce a higher rate of profit, for it is assumed that wages are equal to the subsistence of the worker. Increase of productivity, then, does not benefit the worker but the employer. The point is simple. Reverting to Marx's illustration, suppose the cost in money of 10 lbs. of cotton remains the same, 10s., and the wear and tear of machinery is also unchanged, 2s. Now if the value added by labour to the product during a twelve-hour process rises from 6s. to 12s., the surplus value created by the labourer is 9s. instead of 6s.—for the employer will not pay more than 3s. as wages. Thus surplus value rises with the increase of productivity; greater the productivity of labour, higher is the rate of profit.

Is agriculture more productive than industry? If the rate of profit is higher in agriculture (and it must be so if Marx's account of exploitation is true), national labour must be more productive in agriculture than in manufacturing industries.

Marx made no statistical study of this problem. His followers accept his conclusions as men of good faith. But statistical data exist which enable us to give a definite and decisive answer to this question.

Mihail Manoilescu, President of the Union of the Chambers of Commerce and Industry, Rumania, in his *Théorie du Protectionisme et de L'E change International* ⁴⁰ bases his entire argument in favour of protection on the greater productiveness of labour in industry than in agriculture.

40 Paris, 1929.

For the year 1926 the net value of agricultural produce of Rumania is estimated at 100,000,000,000 lei. The agricultural population of Rumania being a little over 14,000,000, net agricultural income per head amounted to 6,400 lei.

But we are not concerned with the whole agricultural population, or income per head of the population. Every one who consumes does not produce. The argument may therefore be limited to workers alone. Neglecting women, who, however, take a considerable share in agricultural work in Rumania, and taking only males between the ages of 15 and 60 it is found that 4,000,000 workers produced a net agricultural income of 100,000,000,000 lei. Income per worker thus amounted to 25,000 lei in a year, equal to 820 Swiss francs or 2 25 Swiss francs (Re. 1-3) per day. "Thus one may say," remarks M. Manoilescu, "that in general an export of agricultural products of the value of 1,000 Swiss francs (about £40) represents the labour of 1.6 producers for a year. *Voila des chiffres effrayants*" (terrifying figures!)⁴¹. Indian figures are still more terrifying, for the average earnings of the Indian agricultural worker are far less than Re. 1-3 per day, say about 2-3 annas.

M. Manoilescu then quotes statistics showing the total income of twenty-two countries, the proportion of agricultural income to total income, and the proportion of agricultural workers to the total number of workers in each country. Taking the twenty-two countries together, it is found that 20 per cent of the total income was produced by 52 per cent of the total number of workers, and 80

41 Mons. Manoilescu, loc. cit. p. 57.

per cent of the total income by 48 per cent of the total number of workers. A simple calculation shows that "all other human activities are on an average approximately 4.35 times more productive than agricultural activity." And that is what M. Manoilescu describes as '*l'infériorité intrinsèque*' of agriculture in contrast to '*la supériorité intrinsèque*' of industry ⁴².

More clearly, if 52 per cent of the working population (those engaged in agriculture) produce 20 per cent of the national income, then the productivity of national labour in agriculture is about 38.5 per cent of the average national productivity of labour in a year.

If 48 per cent of the total working population (the non-agricultural population) produce 80 per cent of the total national income, then the productivity of national labour in industry (non-agricultural occupations) is about 166.6 per cent of the average national productivity of labour in a year.

All other occupations are thus $4\frac{1}{3}$ times as productive as agriculture (166.6 : 38.5).

The national incomes which serve as the basis for this demonstration relate to the years 1909-11, or 1920. Later figures are available for Germany.

In the year 1936, 35 per cent of the workers in Germany, engaged in agriculture, produced 22 per cent of the total income of that country. The average annual productivity of the worker on the land was thus 22 : 35.63 per cent of the average annual national productivity of labour. In industry, 65 per cent of the total number of workers produced the remaining 78 per cent of the national

42 Manoilescu, p. 61.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

income. The average annual productivity of labour in industry was thus $78 : 63 = 120$ per cent of the average annual national productivity of labour. "That means," says M. Manoilescu, "that the average annual productivity of labour in industry in Germany is twice as great (precisely $120 : 63 = 190$ per cent) as in agriculture."⁴³

Reliable data for estimating India's agricultural and non-agricultural income do not exist, consequently all estimates of our national income must be largely conjectural. Still, even in India, according to Principal Findlay Shirras's figures of our national income, the productivity of labour in industry is higher than in agriculture.

Principal Shirras estimates the total income of British India in 1921-22 at 2,866 crores, of which 1,983 crores was agricultural, and 883 crores non-agricultural income⁴⁴. According to the Census of 1921 the total number of workers was 146·4 millions, of whom 103·7 millions were engaged in the exploitation of animals and vegetation. Thus 72 per cent of the total number of workers, those engaged in agriculture, produced 69 per cent of the national income, the productivity of labour on the land being 96 per cent of the average annual national productivity of labour ($69 : 72$). The remaining 28 per cent of the workers produced 31 per cent of the national income, their productivity being 111 per cent of the average annual national productivity of labour ($31 : 28$). Thus in the year 1921-22, the productivity of labour in non-agricultural occupations was 15 per cent greater than in agriculture ($111 : 96$).

There are good reasons for believing that at the

⁴³ *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, Kiel, for November 1938, p. 144*.

⁴⁴ *The Science of Public Finance* (Macmillan, 1924), p. 141.

MARXISM IS DEAD

present time the productivity of industrial labour in India is greater than that of agricultural labour by considerably more than 15 per cent. During the past 17 years India's industrial output has rapidly expanded under the powerful stimulus of protection, while agricultural income has been reduced to a little more than half as compared with 1921-22 on account of the fall of prices. Prices of manufactured goods have also fallen, but less heavily than those of primary products.

The following is an extract from the review of the report on the working of the Punjab Court of Wards during 1936-37:

"On 225,369 acres of cultivated land under the management of the Court during 1936-37, the gross income (less land revenue) averaged only Rs. 3-13 per acre. If the average value of this land were put at only Rs. 150 an acre, the return would amount to little more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the capital and the net return would probably be round about 2 per cent. These figures suggest that the return from land is substantially lower than the return from most other forms of investment" (*Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, dated 18th March, 1939).

The average rate of industrial profits (net) at the present time may be about three times higher than net income from agriculture.

We are not called upon to determine exactly the degree in which industry, generally speaking, is more productive than agriculture. The result of our argument is to show that industry is more productive than agriculture. There is no escape from this conclusion. One is compelled to agree with Mons. Manoilescu that agricultural countries stand to gain by industrialization on account of the

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

intrinsic superiority of industry over agriculture as a source of income. India is energetically pursuing this policy. India is a poor country because she is predominantly an agricultural country. For the same reasons industrialization is such a prominent feature of Soviet planning.

Well then, if it is admitted that industry is more productive than agriculture, what becomes of Marx's argument that agriculture produces more surplus value than industry? Most certainly the technical composition of agricultural capital is lower than that of industrial capital. More human labour is used in agriculture in proportion to constant capital than in industry. Since there are more labourers to exploit, more surplus value must be created, and a higher rate of profit realized. And yet, when facts are examined, the reverse is found to be true !

The whole superstructure of exploitation raised by Marx on the foundation of a ridiculous dialectic (passage of quantity into quality), falls to the ground.

THE REAL NATURE OF PROFIT

In *Capital*, Vol. I, it is explained that the emergence of surplus value is due to the magnitude of capital that sets labour in motion. When the quantity of capital employed in production is increased, at a certain stage quantity is transformed into quality, or surplus value, really due to the labourer, is created, which is pocketed by the employer. The employer does nothing or performs no services for which he may expect a reward. When the capitalist exclaims, "Oh, but I advanced my money for the express purpose of making more money,"

MARXISM IS DEAD

Marx tells him that "Hell is paved with good intentions."⁴⁵ Marx ridicules the conception of interest as a reward for abstinence. When the employer mentions his 'labour of superintendence,' his foreman and his manager 'shrug their shoulders.'⁴⁶ It is true that when this argument is taking place between the employer and his men, surplus value has not emerged. But that is of small importance. When surplus value arises, it is attributed wholly to increase in the magnitude of capital, not to any services performed by the capitalist.

But how is a process of creating value converted into a process of creating surplus value? Is the change automatic, like the passage of quantity into quality in physical science?

In *Capital*, Vol. III, Marx contrasts the landlord who enjoys surplus value from land, or rent, with the capitalist who enjoys surplus value in industry, or profits: "The capitalist performs at least an active function himself in the development of surplus value and surplus products [lit. 'is still himself an active functionary in the development of this surplus value and surplus product.'] But the landlord has but to capture his growing share in the surplus product and the surplus value created without his assistance."⁴⁷

⁴⁵ *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 213 (Kerr ed.).

⁴⁶ "*Sein eigener Werkfuhrer und sein Direktor zucken die Achseln* (*Das Kapital*, Kautsky's ed., p. 148) Translation in Kerr. ed: "His overlooker and his manager try to hide their smiles" *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 215). The difference is immaterial. But still, since *Das Kapital* is our Veda, we may as well as know what Marx actually wrote. When the two functionaries never smile in the text, the question of their trying to hide their smiles does not arise!

⁴⁷ *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 748. Kerr ed. "*Der Kapitalist ist noch selbsttaetiger Funktionaer in der Entwicklung dieses Mehrwerts und Mehrprodukts*" (Vol. III, Part II. 4th ed., edited by F. Engels, Hamburg, 1919).

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY

Rent is a wholly unnecessary payment. If landlords disappeared, land would still remain, and continue to yield the same products as before. Agricultural production does not depend upon the existence of a class of landlords who render no services either to the land or to their tenants. Landlords are parasites in the truest sense of the term.

But a capitalist, who is himself an active functionary in the creation of surplus value, is not a parasite in the same sense. If he were not there, less value would be produced. He may be regarded as a creator of value. How does he create value?

In Marx's own words the would-be capitalist 'with the keen eye of an expert' selects the means of production and the kind of labour-power best adapted to his particular trade. The labourer works under the 'control' of the capitalist, "the capitalist taking good care that the work is done in a proper manner, and that the means of production are used with intelligence."⁴⁸ When many labourers are working under a master, there is scope for greater division of labour and specialization of machinery. 'Control' means method, order, discipline. There is avoidance of waste. Rationalization and scientific management increase the productivity of labour. That is how surplus value is created. That is how ten or a hundred men working separately on their own account, would create less value than when working together under expert management.

Quantity thus does not automatically turn into quality. It is the active function of the employer as employer that

⁴⁸ *Capital*, Vol. I., Kerr ed., pp. 205-6.

is responsible for the change.

It goes without saying that the employer has a justifiable claim to at least a portion of the additional value created by organization. Organization is a distinct factor of production.

In a capitalist economy this active function is performed by the individual capitalist for the sake of profit. In a socialist economy there are no private capitalists and no profit, but the work of the capitalist is performed by a number of men who plan production and those who direct the execution of the plan. Organization as a factor of production does not disappear, nor is the reward for this service eliminated. The only material change is the substitution of a salary for profit.

The director of a factory in Soviet Russia commands a salary of 2,000 rubles a month; those who plan production must be paid substantially more.

Interest has not been abolished in the Soviet Union. If a socialist country rewards 'abstinence' or 'waiting' by a rate of interest, the payment of interest is not unjustifiable in a capitalist economy. To the demand of Soviet depositors and bond-holders for interest the Soviet Government does not respond like Marx: "Hell is paved with good intentions." The Government pays the stipulated rate of interest. If it did not, saving would be discouraged, less capital would be available for investment and production would decline.

I am not arguing that the labourer, in a capitalist economy, gets the full value of the labour to which he is entitled. Where labour is unorganized, wages tend to settle at a point below the marginal worth of labour. Even when labour is well organized, the labourer may be

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—QUANTITY AND QUALITY
entitled to higher wages than he is actually paid. But the difference is not considerable.

It cannot be considerable when the average monthly wage in light industry in Russia, 196·5 rubles (=about Rs. 23 in purchasing power) is less than the average monthly wage in the mill industry in the Bombay Presidency (or in an industrially backward country like India), Rs. 27·8 (=222 rubles in purchasing power). It cannot be considerable when the purchasing power of the German worker is nearly twice as great under National Socialism or Fascism, and of the British worker nearly four times as great under capitalism as that of the average industrial worker in socialist Russia (see Chapter V).

CHAPTER III

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM—NEGATION OF THE NEGATION.

The reader should have already gained some insight into the difference between utopian and scientific socialism. Both condemn the exploitation of man by man. But while the utopian socialist talks of exploitation in vague, general terms, the scientific socialist shows how surplus value is produced, and how the degree of exploitation may be determined. Further, this exploitation is inevitable. At a certain stage quantity is transformed into quality, or money is turned into capital. The passage of quantity into quality (giving rise to the production of surplus value or exploitation) is as inevitable in economic relations as it is in nature. Economics, or our social life, is thus brought under an all-pervading dialectical law.

And now we come to perhaps the most interesting of all the dialectical principles—negation of the negation. While the passage of quantity into quality enables us to understand the origin and growth of exploitation, the dialectical principle of negation of the negation enables to predict the ultimate end of capitalism and the future form of human society.

Communism (or Marxism, for Marxian socialism is communism) is founded on negation of the negation. The principle being of fundamental importance, and of universal application, it has a claim on our most earnest attention.

We shall begin with easy examples. A grain is

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

planted in the soil. It sprouts, that is, it ceases to exist. The plant is the product of a negation; it comes into existence by negating the grain, or the seed. The plant grows and bears ears of corn, and then the stalk dies. The decay and death of the stalk is negation of the negation. But this negation of the negation is a mark of progress. Instead of a single grain we have now many.

The next example is from animal life. A butterfly comes into existence by negating the egg. Butterflies pair and are in turn negated, that is they die.

Similar is the case of man. A child is born, negating something or other, passes through various stages of life, and the old man finally dies. Death is the negation of life. If there is life beyond the grave, it may be conceived as negation of negation of the negation.

It is thus demonstrated "that the negation of the negation *takes place in reality* (italics Engels's) in both divisions of the organic world" ¹.

The principle is found working in geology as well—"the whole of geology is a series of negated negations." The original earth crust was broken by oceanic, metereological and atmospherico-chemical action—the first negation. But that was only the beginning of strata formation. New strata were continually formed and continually destroyed to serve as material for the formation of ever new strata.

Or consider the working of this dialectical principle in mathematics. We take an algebraic magnitude, a , and negate it. The negation of a is $-a$. We then negate $-a$, which is done by multiplying $-a$ by $-a$. We get

1 *Anti-Duehring*, p. 155.

a². The original positive magnitude reappears, but at a higher degree. It is like a seed multiplying itself through negation of the negation.

The development of philosophical speculation has been governed by this most wonderful of dialectical principles. The philosophy of antiquity was 'natural materialism.' In course of time it was negated by idealism. But idealism in its turn has been negated by the rise of modern materialism. Modern materialism is not a replica of the old 'natural materialism.' It is much richer in content.

'Modern materialism' of which Engels spoke about 60 years ago, is being slowly transformed as the result of new conceptions of the universe. Leaders of thought like Jeans, Eddington and Whitehead are more idealists than materialists. The growth of new idealism in science and philosophy may be interpreted as a further negation of negation of the negation. The series, in fact, is unending.

Negation of the negation suggests some startling conclusions.

Humanity has progressed steadily from barbarism to its present stage. The primitive man was a savage, a beast. The story of humanity is the story of advancing culture, of increasing mastery over nature, of development of humanitarian sentiments—or, in one word, story of civilization. As man became less and less brutal, forms of exploitation also changed, as we have seen.

From barbarism to civilization was a long step. But it was achieved. Barbarism was negated by civilization.

But this negation must produce its own negation. The inexorable dialectical law which we have been con-

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

sidering will compel humanity to relapse into barbarism once more. Idealism which negated 'natural materialism' found its negation in 'modern materialism,' which is materialism at bottom, though enriched by two thousand years of development of philosophy and the natural sciences—it is M raised to the power two, or four, or ten. The new barbarism, towards which humanity is being inevitably pushed by the dialectical law will, similarly, be founded on the victories of science and invention. It will be B raised to the power 10 or 100. Signs of the approaching negation of the negation, are, alas ! only too noticeable. Consider the rise of dictatorships in Italy and Germany (Stalin is different—Russia, as every one knows, is the greatest democracy in the world). Hitler and Mussolini represent brute force—not the primitive brute force which used a club as its weapon, but brute force employing powerful tanks, howitzers and death-dealing bombing-planes to gain its violent ends. Are Hitler and Mussolini civilised ? Ask any Marxist. They are modern barbarians—or negation of the negation.

Reasoning dialectically again we reach the conclusion that having attained a certain stage in evolution, human intelligence will begin to decay, or that it will negate itself.

Man has evolved from infra-human ancestors. A single look at a skull of primitive man is sufficient to destroy faith in descent from *Rishis*. The Neanderthal man was bestial in structure unlike any man now living. The primitive man was not highly intelligent—his brain structure made that impossible. As man passed from the simian to the human stage, the structure of the brain changed—every lobe of the cerebrum and of the

cerebellum shows sings of development.

If intelligence was the negation of the primitive lack of intelligence, stupidity is the negation of intelligence, stupidity such as is revealed by millions of human beings who have accepted, without a protest, the rule of Hitler and Mussolini. Again, the case of the Soviet Union is different. There the ruler is the darling of the people ; he represents, or embodies their will. But look at these Germans and Italians ! They do not show a spark of intelligence. They go blindly where the Fuehrer or the Duce leads them, like unthinking automats. It is primitive stupidity multiplied a hundredfold !

Perhaps the reader is inclined to protest. Perhaps I have misinterpreted negation of the negation. I admit I am not soaked in dialectic. Dialectic, perhaps, yields the most fruitful results only in the hands of an expert. It may be like the technique of fasting. 'When a Mahatma 'fasts unto death,' the objective is gained. But when anyone else fasts, the thing becomes a joke.

We, therefore, return to the negation of negation as expounded by the greatest of expert dialectitians, Marx. We are specially interested in Marxian dialectic because it is concerned with economic relationships.

Property, in the beginning, is commonly owned. This is our *a*. The form of the negation—*a* is private property. The negation of the negation is the abolition of private property ². This is our *a*². The new form of pro-

² *Anti-Duehring*, pp. 156-57 :—

"It is the same, too, in history. All civilised peoples begin with the common ownership of the land. With all peoples who have passed a certain primitive stage, in the course of the development of agriculture this common ownership becomes a fetter on production. It is

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

perty is not just *a*, the primitive common ownership, but a most developed form which permits the fullest utilization of instruments of production for the good of all. Marx says, ³ :—

“The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisitions of the capitalist era, *i.e.*, on co-operation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production.”

The abolition of private property in the means of production is inevitable. The negation of the negation is inexorable, even like a Law of Nature. It is a Law of Nature, for it is found operating in the physical world.

A sad fate awaits the capitalist and the landlord. They expropriated the hand-worker and the peasant. But they must be expropriated in their turn.

abolished, negated, and after a longer or shorter series of intermediate stages is transformed into private property. But at a higher stage of agricultural development, brought about by private property in land itself, private property in turn becomes a fetter on production as is the case today, both with small and large landownership. The demand that it also should be negated, that it should once again be transformed into common property, necessarily arises. But this demand does not mean the restoration of the old original common ownership, but the institution of a far higher and more developed form of possession in common which, far from being a hindrance to production, on the contrary for the first time frees production from all fetters and gives it the possibility of making full use of modern chemical discoveries and mechanical inventions.”

3 *Capital*, Vol. I, Kerr ed., p. 837.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Capitalism contains within its bosom the seeds of its own destruction. As means of production become more and more centralized, the property-less labourer grows poorer and poorer. But by bringing masses of labourers together, the capitalist system digs its own grave. The workers, made desperate by pangs of hunger, unite and rise in revolt against their masters. The expropriators are expropriated ⁴. The negation of the negation is complete.

4 *Capital*, Vol. I, Kerr ed. pp. 836-37 :—"As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialization of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

Possibly this negation of the negation might not take place if the mass of misery and suffering did not increase with the growing centralization of means of production, or with the growth of accumulation. But it does. Marx is positive about this: "Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time, accumulation of misery, agony, toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, *i.e.*, on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital" ⁵.

Here is a fearful contradiction. The productive powers of the community increase with the accumulation of wealth. Money is constantly, and in ever-increasing amounts, turned into capital—a constant and increasing transformation of quantity into quality. But the large mass of consumers, the working population, is ever growing poorer and poorer, not only in a relative but an absolute sense. Inevitably there are periodic crises, which dislocate production. And inevitably does the spirit of revolt grow in the exploited, but disciplined masses.

The dialectic of the abolition of private property was also expounded by Marx in the *Holy Family* (Chapter 4):—

"Proletariat and Wealth are opposites. As such they form a whole. They are both formations of the world of private property. What concerns us here is to define the particular position they take within the opposition. It is not enough to state that they are two sides of a whole.

"Private property as private property, as wealth, is forced to maintain its own existence and thereby the existence of its opposite, the proletariat. It is the positive side of the opposition, private property satisfied in itself.

capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

5. *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 709.

MARXISM IS DEAD

"*Vice versa*, the proletariat is, as proletariat, forced to abolish itself and, with this, the opposite which determines it, which makes it the proletariat, private property. It is the negative side of the opposition, its principle of unrest, private property which is dissolved and in process of dissolution . . .

"Within the opposition, therefore, the owner of private property is the conservative, the proletariat the destructive party. From the former derives the action of preservation of the opposition, from the latter the action of its destruction.

"Of course, in its economic movement private property drives on to its own dissolution, but only by a development which is independent of and opposed to its will, unconscious, conditioned by the nature of the matter; *i.e.*, by the production of the proletariat as proletariat, of poverty which is conscious of its intellectual and bodily poverty, of loss of humanity, conscious of itself and therefore abolishing itself. The proletariat carries out the verdict which private property pronounces on itself by the very production of the proletariat, just as it carries out the verdict which wage-labour pronounces on itself by producing the wealth of others and its own poverty. If the proletariat is victorious it does not at all mean that it has become the absolute side of society, for it is victorious only by abolishing itself and its opposite. Then both the proletariat and its conditioning opposite, private property, have vanished."

Note the opposition of proletariat and wealth, and the role of poverty in the whole process. Private property pronounces upon itself the verdict of abolition by producing the proletariat, which is the opposite of wealth. It is on account of this irreconcilable opposition that private property is compelled to sign its own death-warrant.

THE TWO POLES

The theory of the two poles (wealth accumulating at the one and poverty and misery at the other) is accepted by all communists. It is, in fact, the pivot of the whole argument. Marx, Engels, Lenin and other communists again and again stress the impoverishment of the masses

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

with the growth of capitalist production.

According to Marx, wages are determined (as we have already seen) by the '*price of the necessary means of subsistence*.' The cost of production of simple labour-power amounts to the '*cost of the existence and propagation of the worker*' (italics Marx's). That does not mean that every worker secures his means of existence: "Individual workers indeed, millions of workers, do not receive enough to be able to exist and to propagate themselves; but the wages of the whole working class adjust themselves, within the limits of their fluctuations, to this minimum." ⁶

In his *Value, Price and Profit* (pp. 79-80) Marx tells as that "the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages, to push the value of labour more or less to its minimum limit."

Lenin says: ⁷ "The worker is impoverished *absolutely*, i.e., grows actually poorer than before, is compelled to live worse, eat more sparingly, remain underfed, seek shelter in cellars and attics. The relative share of the workers in capitalist society, which is rapidly growing richer, becomes ever smaller, because the millionaires grow richer ever more rapidly In capitalist society wealth grows with unbelievable rapidity alongside the impoverishment of the working masses."

If the worker did not grow poorer not only relatively but absolutely, there would be no sharpening of the inherent contradictions of capitalism. If the condition of

⁶ *Wage, Labour and Capital*, pp. 26-27 (Martin Lawrence).

⁷ Quoted by Leontiev in *Political Economy* (Martin Lawrence), p. 120.

MARXISM IS DEAD

the working classes actually improved with the growth of accumulation, the opposition between proletariat and poverty would tend to weaken. "How absurd!" the Marxist exclaims. Negation must produce its own negation. The proletarian revolution is inevitable.

INEVITABILITY

Inevitability of the transition from capitalism to communism serves to distinguish 'scientific' from 'utopian' socialism. A utopian socialist asks for the abolition of exploitation of man by man on moral or ethical grounds. Dialectical materialism is not concerned with the moral aspect of the question. It makes no appeal to our sense of justice, to our conscience. No useful purpose would be served by such appeals either, knowing as we do that the capitalist is a heartless monster. The 'scientific' socialist believes that the change must come on account of the inherent contradictions of capitalism.

A utopian socialist, like Bazard, argues that if the instruments of production were socialized and the State set everybody to work, crises would be eliminated. The argument is still ethical. A particular course of action is recommended because it is better adapted for the realization of a given end. The point of view of Marx is different. Private property must go because of the negation of the negation. We do not work for the change because it is desirable to bring it about. The change accomplishes itself in virtue of the operation of a Natural Law. Dialectic teaches that quantity is transformed into quality. It follows that revolutions, signifying abrupt changes, are natural and inevitable. Dialectic teaches

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

that the struggle between opposites, ever growings harper is the cause of development. It follows that the class-struggle will inevitably realize a higher form of social order.

Marx objected to the application of morality to economics. Engels says ⁸ :—

“According to the laws of bourgeois economics, the greatest part of the product does not belong to the workers who have produced it. If we now say : that is unjust, that ought not to be so, then that has nothing immediately to do with economics. We are merely saying that this economic fact is in contradiction to our moral sentiment. Marx, therefore, never based his communist demands upon this, but upon the inevitable collapse of the capitalist mode of production which is daily taking place before our eyes to an ever greater degree.”

In 1918 Lenin wrote :—

“ . . . a revolutionary Marxist is distinguished from the ordinary philistine by his ability and willingness to preach to the still ignorant masses the necessity of the approaching revolution, to prove that it is inevitable, to explain its advantages to the people, and to prepare the proletariat and all the toiling and exploited masses for it.” ⁹

There is thus a profound difference between the philistine and the genuine socialist, or Marxist. The one talks of what may be done to better the lot of the worker, to increase production, to adjust supply to demand, to

⁸ *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 10-11.

⁹ Quoted by Adoratsky in *Dialectical Materialism* (Martin Lawrence), p. 10.

abolish unemployment, and generally to increase the sum total of human happiness. Thus the philistine. The Marxist, on the contrary, while conscious of the material advantages which would flow to the proletariat from cutting the throats of the bourgeoisie, shows that the new order would be the inevitable product of the economic law of change, of the struggle of opposites, of the negation of the negation.¹⁰ The change is effected through proletarian action. We work for it. But we are mere instruments which the dialectical law uses to work out its inevitable effects. Lord Sri Krishna exhorted Arjuna to fight even when the defeat of the enemy was inevitable, or was pre-ordained: '*Nimitt matram bhav savyasachin,*' said the Lord ("Be thou the outward cause, left-handed one.")

THE WEAKEST OR THE STRONGEST LINK

Where will the proletarian revolution first occur? Inevitably in the country in which there is the strongest opposition between proletariat and wealth, in which there is the greatest accumulation of wealth on account of the greatest development of the capitalist system. In such a country, according to dialectical reasoning, the condition of the working class would be of the extremest poverty and misery. In such a country, industrial labour, on account

10 Adoratsky says—*Dialectical Materialism* (p. 43) :—

"We cannot understand capitalism unless we grasp the unity of opposites made up of bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and unless we realize the inevitability of the transition from capitalism to communism by means of the class-struggle of the proletariat. We cannot understand the unity of the opposites: ether and matter, negative and positive electricity, attraction and repulsion. A struggle of opposites. a perpetual succession of forms, transitions from state to state, from form to form—such is the dialectics of the world that surrounds us."

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

of the historical laws of capitalism, would be the best disciplined in the world, and most filled with the spirit of revolt. In such a country individual ownership of property would have been negated most completely by the concentration of means of production in the hands of a microscopically small, privileged class. Here then must inevitably occur the first negation of the negation if negation of the negation is a dialectical law governing human society. Such, indeed, was the conclusion of both Marx and Engels. In his 'Principles of Communism,'¹¹ Engels says:—

"Question Nineteen: Can such a revolution take place in one country alone?"

"Answer: No. Large-scale industry, by creating a world-market, has so linked up the peoples of the earth, and especially the civilized peoples of the earth, that each of them is dependent on what happens in other lands. Further, the social development of all civilised countries has become so similar that everywhere the struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat, the two classes of society upon which the issue depends, has become the dominating struggle of the day. The communist revolution will, therefore, not be a national revolution alone; it will take place in all civilized countries, or at least in Great Britain, the United States, France, and Germany, at one and the same time. In each of these countries it will take a longer or a shorter time to develop according to whether industrial life has attained a high degree of evolution, has amassed great wealth, and has a considerable quantity of the forces of production at its disposal. The revolution will assume its slowest pace and be most difficult of achievement in Germany; in Great Britain it will go ahead quickly and easily. It will exercise considerable influence upon all other lands, changing and hastening the process of their development. This is to be a universal revolution, and will, therefore, have the whole world as field for its operation."

¹¹ *The Communist Manifesto*, edited by Ryazanoff (Martin Lawrence), pp. 332-33.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Engels was aware that the development of capitalism in different countries was not uniform. He expected that the pace of the revolution would be slower in less advanced and quicker in more advanced countries. This conclusion strictly follows from the dialectical principle of negation of the negation. Suppose property is widely distributed among the masses, or there is no concentration or monopoly in the means of production: in such a country no negation has yet taken place which the proletarian revolution will negate. Negation of the negation presupposes a negation which has to be negated.

Marx, similarly, had very high hopes of the British worker.

In April, 1856, a 'little banquet' was held in London to celebrate the anniversary of the *People's Paper*; Marx, in responding to the toast 'The proletarians of Europe,' said: "The English working men are the first-born sons of modern industry. Certainly then, they will not be the last to aid the social revolution produced by that industry—a revolution which means the emancipation of their class all over the world, which is as universal as capital-rule and wage-slavery."¹²

Why did Marx expect that 'the first-born sons of modern industry' would not be the last to aid the social revolution? For the good, solid and all-sufficient dialectical reason that the divorce of property from labour was 'complete' in Great Britain¹³. Of all countries, therefore, Great Britain fulfilled in the highest

¹² *Marx-Engels Correspondence* (Lawrence and Wishart), p. 91.

¹³ Marx wrote in March, 1854 :—"Great Britain, of all other countries, has seen developed on the greatest scale the despotism of capital and the slavery of labour. In no other country have the inter-

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

degree the requisite condition for the negation of the negation.

And yet labourers in no country seem to be more unwilling to make a revolution than British labourers. Something is fundamentally wrong with dialectical materialism: revolutions occur where there is no negation to be negated. And they fail to occur where negation exists for negation in the most violent manner!

Ah!”, the critic will exclaim, “you are forgetting the Leninist law of ‘uneven development’ under capitalism. Marx and Engels knew this law perfectly well, and still they drew conclusions regarding negation of the negation just the opposite of those reached by Lenin.

Of course Lenin was a good Marxist, and soaked in dialectic. Lenin wrote in August, 1915¹⁴ :—

“Irregularity in economic and political development is an invariable law of capitalism. It is, therefore, possible for socialism to triumph at the outset in a small number of capitalist countries, nay, even in one alone. The victorious proletariat in such a land, having expropriated the capitalists and having organised socialist

mediate stations between the millionaire commanding whole industrial armies and the wage-slave living only from hand to mouth so, gradually, been swept away from the soil. There exist here no longer as in continental countries, large classes of peasants and artisans almost equally dependent on their own property and labour. A complete divorce of property from labour has been effected in Great Britain. In no other country, therefore, the war between the two classes that constitute modern society has assumed so colossal dimensions and features so distinct and palpable.” (From Marx’s Letter of 9th March, 1854, to the “Labour Parliament” in Manchester—published in the *People’s Paper*, 18th March, 1854) *Marx-Engels Correspondence*, p. 88

14 *Leninism*, by J. Stalin, Vol. I, pp. 58-59.

MARXISM IS DEAD

production, would rise against the remainder of the capitalist world, winning over to its cause the oppressed classes in other lands, inciting them to revolt against the capitalists, and even, when needs must, having recourse to armed intervention against the exploiting classes and their States."

Just now we are not concerned with 'socialism in our country,' but the character of the country in which the negation of the negation occurs. Is this capitalist country highly industrialized, or mainly an agricultural country?

A Soviet economist says ¹⁵:—

"Thus the Leninist law of uneven development is of tremendous significance for revolutionary practice. Stalin points out that even during the war, Lenin, basing himself on the law of the uneven development of imperialist countries, counterposed to the theory of the opportunists his theory of the proletarian revolution, the teaching of the triumph of socialism in a single country 'even though this country is capitalistically less developed.' "

Suppose we admit that socialism can come even when a country is capitalistically less developed. What does the admission mean? The negation of the negation is reduced to a farce. The passage of quantity into quality becomes a joke. Or one can make dialectical materialism mean whatever one pleases. Negation is negated where negation exists and negation is negated where it does not exist! Such is this fraud of dialectical materialism. Like capitalism, dialectical materialism

15. Leontiev loc. cit., p. 218.

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

contains within its bosom the seeds of its own destruction.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

No revolution has occurred anywhere in the world confirming the overthrow of capitalism in accordance with the dialectical principle of negation of the negation. The Russian revolution was not such a revolution. Mr. M. N. Roy, a co-worker of Lenin, in his book, *The Russian Revolution*, says¹⁶ :—

“ We can profitably remember Lenin’s memorable speech introducing the new policy in the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Addressing those who were afraid that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be weakened by the new policy, he said : ‘ We want dictatorship of the proletariat. But where is the proletariat ? Ours is an industrially backward country. The proletariat was always very small numerically. Most of it have been killed, either in the war or in the revolution. And in the latter case, the most advanced elements have been the victims. So, if we want to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, let us begin by creating the proletariat. And for that purpose we shall have to adopt any policy that will hasten the industrialization of our country. The policy advocated by me will serve that purpose.’ This is not a *verbatim* quotation. But that is the substance and the spirit of the memorable speech.”

If Mr. Roy has given the substance of Lenin’s speech with substantial accuracy (which I have no reason to doubt), it is clear that the Russian revolution was in no sense a proletarian revolution, and that it did not establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. The revolution triumphed because (i) the defeat of Russia had thrown everything into confusion and (ii) people wanted peace, while Government was bent on continuing the war to a

16 *The Russian Revolution* (D. M. Library, Calcutta), pp. 42-43.

MARXISM IS DEAD

finish. Where authority is, as it were, lying on the ground, any one may pick it up. The Bolsheviks were well-organized, and they played their cards well. First and foremost they promised peace to a war-weary, defeated people. Then they promised land to a landless peasantry (in itself a negation of communism). And they won. It was not the Russian proletariat that made its revolution, but a Party, and it is the same Party that governs Russia today.

This is the barest truth, and yet I doubt whether the un-dialectical nature of the Russian revolution would be admitted by Indians soaked in dialectic. Revolutions do not occur in conformity to any cut and dried principles of dialectic. History reveals exploited humanity groaning under the yoke of tyranny for long centuries, without a thought of revolt. There is no 'inevitability' in human relations such as we meet in physical science. At zero degree centigrade water freezes. The passage of quantity into quality is inevitable. Such qualitative changes in history are not inevitable. And the form of the change can never be predicted.

If the Marxist still argues that the Russian revolution is a confirmation of the negation of the negation, or of the passage of quantity into quality, he immediately involves himself in a contradiction. In Marxism the proletariat comes first and the proletarian revolution next. In Russia the revolution came first, and the object of the New Economic Policy was to create a proletariat. It should not be forgotten that by the proletariat we mean the propertyless industrial worker ¹⁷. In Marxism the existence of

17. "By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

the proletariat is essential to negate the negation. In Russia industrialization, after the revolution, was to create the means for negating I do not know what.

Breaking of the chain of Imperialism at the weakest link can in no sense be described as the Marxian negation of the negation which we have been discussing. We may call it Leninism, Stalinism, or Leninist-Stalinism, but it is not Marxism. If the hold of Holland on her colonies weakens, the Dutch East Indies may throw off the Imperialist yoke. In a sense this is a negation, for liberty is the negation of slavery. And if Holland reconquered her possessions, the negation would be negated. To conform to Marxian dialectic, a revolution must be the work of the industrial proletariat. The industrial proletariat must be driven to revolt by growing poverty and misery side by side with the growing accumulation of wealth. Where these conditions are not satisfied, a revolution, whether at the weakest or the strongest link of the Imperialist chain is not the Marxian negation of the negation.

Such a revolution cannot occur.

With the growth of accumulation the material condition of the labourer improves. The worker is not impoverished absolutely. Marx and Engels knew that, and Lenin, particularly, had no excuse for ignoring facts. It is not necessary to produce formal evidence in support of this point. The facts regarding increase in the real wages of British labour are too well known. The British

labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage labourers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour-power in order to live " (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Martin Lawrence, p. 1, n.)

MARXISM IS DEAD

labourer is far better housed, clothed and fed today than a hundred years ago.

It may be shown that the British worker is relatively worse off than before. But relative decrease and absolute decrease in the share of the worker in the wealth produced are not the same thing. Marx, Engels and Lenin insist on impoverishment of the worker in the absolute sense. The whole dialectic of the proletarian revolution is founded on the accumulation of misery at one pole and of wealth at the other pole. If the two poles are imaginary, the whole dialectical argument breaks down.

It is not difficult to understand why the 'first born sons of modern industry' do not make a revolution.

Economics has very little use for negation of the negation. Possibly in physical science negation of the negation has a precise, definite meaning. Physicists, with the help of negation of the negation, may learn to know what they have to look for. In economics — a multiplied by — a may produce anything except a^2 .

This is not the fault of negation of the negation, but of the nature of the economic world. Given actions produce uncertain and unpredictable reactions.

Firstly, our — a is not what Marx supposed it was. We have seen that wages are not governed by any natural law which fixes them at the level of means of subsistence.

Secondly, it is not true that the growth of capitalism effects a complete divorce between labour and property. Capitalism brings into existence a form of property which is capable of the widest diffusion—industrial shares. Capitalism creates a wholly new class of professional and technical men who belong to the proletariat only in

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

their origin, but not in tastes, culture or style of living. There is no re-absorption of this class, or other intermediate classes, into the proletariat. On the contrary, these classes tend to merge into the bourgeoisie. Capitalism thus creates not its own grave-diggers, but the grave-diggers of communism. Given an uninterrupted expansion of capitalism, the condition of the lowest classes, the true proletariat, becomes progressively better in an absolute sense. The better-paid workers may save and own shares; the technical men, or the aristocracy of labour climb into the bourgeoisie. Where is the —a, the negation, which has to be negated?

Admitting that relatively the position of the British worker is worse than before, still his purchasing power is about four times greater than that of the average worker in the Soviet Union, where there is supposed to be no exploitation of man by man. If the sole reason for a change of economic system is better conditions of living for the working masses, most British workers would prefer to be exploited by the bourgeoisie and live well rather than end exploitation and live like paupers.

Negation of the negation reminds one of economic theories (*e.g.*, the quantity theory of money or the purchasing power parity theory) which are true under given assumptions. If the premisses are granted, the conclusion follows, necessarily and mathematically—or ‘inevitably.’ But if a given change produces other changes which are contrary to the assumptions, the result is different. Actual rates of exchange cannot be deduced from a comparison of purchasing power parities on the basis of index numbers of prices. A doubling of the money side

MARXISM IS DEAD

of the equation of exchange does not necessarily and mathematically double the level of prices—under certain conditions prices may neither rise nor fall; under other conditions they may more than double.

So it is with the transformation of capitalism into communism. Given that the growth of accumulation progressively impoverishes the working masses, a proletarian revolution in the long run is inevitable. But when—a does not beget—a, there is nothing to negate the negation with.

But suppose there is such impoverishment. Does it follow necessarily and mathematically that a society would be established in which the State and the State alone owns all instruments of production?

I would say 'no.' Human beings possess intelligence. There is also the illusion of a free will. A certain end has to be realized—greater production and a just distribution of wealth. If we are not like dead, inert matter which blindly and involuntarily registers the effects of mechanical forces, the form of society is for us to choose. The negation of the negation in economics has not one but several possible forms.

There is no ideal society in the absolute sense of the term. Our conception of the ideal is relative. An ideal society for one people or nation may be exactly the opposite for another people or nation.

It is perfectly conceivable that under certain conditions the abolition of private enterprise and thorough-going State management of business may produce, instead of order, the worst possible confusion. It may produce a tyrannical, inefficient and corrupt bureaucracy. While

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

the exploitation of man by man is abolished in theory, in practise new and more terrible forms of exploitation may arise.

Negation of the negation may perfectly well mean intelligent control and direction of capitalism, while private enterprise and the right of private property in the means of production are allowed to exist.

Negation of the negation may mean joint-ownership and management of industry by the State and capitalists. Skidding, as Haldane says, is the negation of steering and the controlled skid is the negation of the negation. All London bus drivers receive the same instructions—it is not that a skid is controlled sometimes by skilful handling of the steering apparatus, and sometimes by the driver standing on his head. But there is more than one method of removing anarchy in production and ending exploitation. We may choose the best, in view of our capabilities and our requirements, since there is no 'best' in the absolute sense.

For example, State ownership of land is not the only means of ending the exploitation of tenants by landlords. The State may not expropriate non-working owners, but tax rent so heavily as to reduce it to practically nothing. The proceeds of such taxation may be spent for the benefit of the tenantry. It is not clear to me why the abolition of the right of property in land is a necessary condition for the disappearance of rent.

It should certainly be possible for the State, under a system of joint-management and ownership of industrial enterprises, to give wages to labour to which it is justly entitled. It should be possible for the State to adjust production to consumption.

MARXISM IS DEAD

The industrial bus tends to skid. The real problem is that of evolving, consciously and deliberately, a controlled skid. There is no transformation of capitalism into communism according to the mechanical working of any dialectical law.

THE STATE NEGATED

Lenin accused Bukharin of 'semi-anarchism.' The Public Prosecutor, Vyshinsky, did not fail to draw the attention of the Court at Bukharin's trial to Bukharin's 'anarcho-syndicalist ideas about the proletariat's hostility in principle to the State, the necessity to blow up any State whatsoever' ¹⁸. It is undoubtedly true that Bukharin was 'guilty of semi-anarchistic errors on the question of the State' †.

But so were Marx and Engels. The 'semi-anarchistic errors' of Bukharin on the question of the State were not original. He borrowed them from the founders of 'scientific' socialism.

Marx could not have easily escaped being shot if he had been living in the U.S.S.R. today. It may not be long before the non-serious prediction made by Hugh Kingsmill and Malcolm Muggridge is actually realised :

"Marx Banned in the U.S.S.R.

"Commenting yesterday on the banning of Karl Marx's works in the U.S.S.R., and the removal of his statues and portraits from public buildings, a *Pravda* editorial says: 'Our ever-loving Leader and Father,

¹⁸ *The Case of the Anti-Soviet Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites*, p. 641 (Moscow, 1938). † Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 446.

NAGATION OF THE NEGATION

Stalin, tirelessly uprooting all enemies of the proletariat, now tears the mask from the Jew-bourgeois-émigré face of the arch-Leninist-Trotskyist-Bukharinite Marx."

There is the strongest contrast between the Fascist and the Socialist State. The Fascist glorifies the State. The State is all-in-all. Every one is in it, no one is outside it : it sits like the Lord in *Bhagwad Gita* 'enveloping all' (*sarvam avritya tishthati*). Fascism does not seek to weaken the sentiment of the State, but to strengthen it. Socialism, on the contrary, completely destroys the ideology of the State ; the State, as Mussolini said at the end of 1922, is reduced to an enormous public 'book-keeping' (*ragioneria*). The State that governs and rules, or exercises political power, is reduced to the position of a manager or administrator, the public services are organized on the model of commercial houses, authority is suppressed and nothing remains except technical direction and management as in private industry.¹⁹ In the struggle with socialism, says Panunzio, fascism was destined to win from the very first : "Socialism has been defeated because socialism, so far from carrying the idea of the State to its supreme height, destroyed the State, denied the State, or, which is the same thing, reduced and degraded the State to administration, to management."²⁰ Writing in 1914 before the rise of fascism, Panunzio had rejected a State which did not govern, but simply administered things, like a Joint-Stock Company : "To say that the State should cease to govern is to say that the State should cease to be a State, which is truly nonsensical."²¹

19. *Il Sentimento dello Stato* by Sergio Panunzio (Liberaria del Littorio, Rome), p. 36. 20 Ibid. p. 71. 21 Ibid. p. 141.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Have Fascists misinterpreted the teachings of Marx and Engels in regard to the State? Panunzio quotes Marx, and particularly Engels, who in his *Anti-Duehring*, according to Panunzio, systematically develops 'with precise anarchical orientation' (*con precisa orientazione anarchica*) the Marxist conception of the State viewed as a product of class-war and destined to disappear with classes and class-war.²²

In his *Poverty of Philosophy* Marx wrote: "The working class in the course of its development, will substitute for the old civil society an association which will exclude classes and their antagonism, and there will not be political power properly so-called any more (*el il n'y aura plus le pouvoir politique proprement dit*), since political power is precisely the official expression (*résumé*) of antagonism in Civil Society."²³

Elsewhere Marx says:—

" . . . all socialists understand by anarchy this : the object of the proletarian movement, the abolition of classes, once attained, the power of the State which serves to maintain the great producing majority under the yoke of a smaller exploiting minority, disappears, and governmental functions transform themselves into simple administrative functions."²⁴

²² Panunzio, loc. cit. p. 42. ²³ Pp. 146-47. In the translation "and there will be more political power" is obviously incorrect. The edition which I possess (Martin Lawrence) was printed in the U.S.S.R.

²⁴ Quoted by Bukharin in *Marxism and Modern Thought*, p. 325:—K. Marx, *Les prétendues scissions de l'Internationale*, 1872, p. 72: "tous les socialistes entendent par l'anarchie ceci : le but du mouvement prolétaire, l'abolition des classes, une fois atteint, le pouvoir de l'Etat, qui sert à maintenir la grande majorité productrice sous le joug d'une minorité exploitante peu nombreuse, disparaît, et les fonctions gouvernementales se transforment en de simples fonctions administratives."

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

If this is what socialists understand by anarchy, the difference between socialism and anarchism, so far as the disappearance of the State is concerned, becomes so small as to be negligible. Both socialists and anarchists view the State as an abomination. It is not that the socialists glorify State-power and would retain it in their ideal society. If that were so, a deep gulf would separate socialists and anarchists. But there is no unbridgeable gulf between the two. The anarchist's State is abolished; the socialist's State dies out (*erstirbt ab*), it 'withers away.' It 'immediately withers away' with the abolition of classes.²⁵ Where there are no classes, and no exploitation of man by man, the State is not required as an engine of repression. When State-ownership of the means of production has been established, a new society arises. "Does this mean," asks Marx, "that after the fall of the old society there will be a new class domination culminating in a new political power?" His answer is, of course, 'No.'²⁶

The answer of Engels was the same: "The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into State property. But in doing this it abol-

²⁵ Lenin in *State and Revolution. Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 28 :—

"*The Communist Manifesto* gives a general summary of history, which compels us to regard the State as the organ of class-rule and leads us to the inevitable conclusion that the proletariat cannot overthrow the bourgeoisie without first capturing political power, without attaining political supremacy, without transforming the State into the 'proletariat organized as the ruling class'; it inevitably leads to the conclusion that this proletarian State will begin to wither away immediately after its victory, because the State is unnecessary and cannot exist in a society in which there are no class antagonisms. The question as to how, from the point of view of historical development, the substitution of the proletarian State for the bourgeois State is to take place is not raised."

²⁶ *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 146.

MARXISM IS DEAD

ishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the State as State."²⁷ The State is no longer needed since nothing more is to be repressed: "The first act by virtue of which the State really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—this is, at the same time its last independent act as a State. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous and then of itself falls asleep (*und schlæft dann von selbst ein*), the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and by the conduct of processes of production."²⁸

Here is then the State which ruled and governed (the Fascist's *lo Stato impero, lo Stato governo*) turned into a book-keeper.²⁹ The change is not sudden; it is depen-

27 *Socialism Utopian and Scientific* (Sonnenschein, 1892), p. 75.

28 *Ibid.* pp. 76-77.

29 The transformation of the State into a book-keeper or into a single factory and a single office begins even in the first phase of communist society. It is of course completed in the higher phase. Lenin says (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 92-94):—"Accounting and control—these are the *principal* things that are necessary for the 'setting up' and correct functioning of the *first phase* of communist society. *All* citizens are transformed into the salaried employees of the State, which consists of the armed workers. *All* citizens become employees and workers of a *single* national State 'syndicate.' All that is required is that they should work equally—do their proper share of work—and get paid equally. The accounting and control necessary for this have been so utterly *simplified* by capitalism that they have become the extraordinarily simple operations of checking, recording and issuing receipts, which anyone who can read and write and who knows the first four rules of arithmetic can perform.

"When the *majority* of the people themselves begin everywhere to keep such accounts and maintain such control over the capitalists (now converted into employees) and over the intellectual gentry, who preserve their capitalist habits, this control will really become universal,

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

dent on the abolition of class antagonisms. And the test of a classless society is ownership of the means of production by the society as a whole.

What is the difference between Engels on the one hand who makes the State, 'fall asleep' and advocates of a 'Free State' and anarchists on the other?

For purposes of agitation a 'Free State' is at times a justifiable demand, but Engels objects to the concept on the ground of "its ultimate scientific insufficiency." It is scientifically insufficient, for 'scientific' socialism has no use for any State whatsoever, free or otherwise. "Free

general, national; and there will be no way of getting away from it, there will be 'nowhere to go.'

"The whole of society will have become a single office and a single factory with equality of work and equality of pay.

"From the moment all members of society, or even only the overwhelming majority, have learned to administer the State *themselves*, have taken this business into their own hands, have 'set up' control over the insignificant minority of capitalists, over the gentry who wish to preserve their capitalist habits, and over the workers who have been completely demoralised by capitalism—from this moment the need for government begins to disappear. The more complete democracy becomes, the nearer the moment approaches when it becomes unnecessary. The more democratic the 'State' of the armed workers—which is 'no longer a State in the proper sense of the word'—becomes, the more rapidly does *the State* begin to wither away.

"For when *all* have learned the art of administration, and will indeed independently administer social production, will independently keep accounts, control the idlers, the gentlefolk, the swindlers and similar 'guardians of capitalist traditions,' the escape from this national accounting and control will inevitably become so increasingly difficult, such a rare exception, and will probably be accompanied by such swift and severe punishment (for the armed workers are practical men and not sentimental intellectuals, and they will scarcely allow anyone to trifle with them), that very soon the *necessity* of observing the simple, fundamental rules of human intercourse will become a *habit*.

"The door will then be wide open for the transition from the first phase of communist society to its higher phase, and with it to the complete withering away of the State."

State—What is this?" exclaimed Marx when he found himself confronted with this negation of 'scientific' socialism in the democratic section of the Gotha programme.³⁰

Engels disagreed with anarchists only so far as they insisted on abolishing the State at once, or over-night as it were (*von heute auf morgen*). Let the State first nationalize instruments of production. It will 'fall asleep' or 'die out' then. The difference between anarchists and socialists on this point is not of vital significance, for no anarchist maintains that the State can go while the means of production are privately owned.

Fascist writers like Panunzio are not mistaken in identifying Marx and Engels with anarchists. Undoubtedly Marx and Engels held semi-anarchistic views in regard to the State. Bukharin was a true disciple of Marx and Engels. He may have been a bad Bolshevik and a thousand other unmentionable things. But he was a better Marxist than Stalin.³¹

30 *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 43.

31 Bukharin's attitude towards the State did not change between 1916 and 1935. This may be judged from the following extracts from his scholarly essay on *Marx's Teaching and its Historical Importance* included in *Marxism and Modern Thought*. His standpoint in this essay is absolutely Marxian, see pp. 77-80:

"By drawing everyone into its direct organization, the State ceases to be itself, and absorbing society into itself, itself dissolves into it without leaving a trace. Class rule over people is transformed into the classless administration of things. This process of the transition to the 'administration of things' is conditioned by the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat includes an absolutely specific relation between economics and politics and a tendency towards the liquidation of classes. . . ."

"Under the proletarian dictatorship the State merges more and more with economy. All the chief economic levers are in the hands of the proletarian State. State organization is also economic organization. The administration of socialist economy is a direct function of the State in its struggle to overcome class oppositions. So here we have a

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

The reader, perhaps, finds it difficult to understand how the State 'falls asleep' or dies out. Will not socialism have its bureaucracy? Socialism is inconceivable without a very large class of bureaucrats. Even the classless administration of things presupposes officials who have charge of this administration. How then does Engels propose 'to throw on the scrap-heap all the useless lumber of the State.'³² Will not the officials form a class or caste, and use State machinery to enforce their will?

No. In the socialist society of Marx there is no set class or caste of officials.

Marx's ideal was the Paris Commune. The Commune was formed of municipal councillors elected by

difference in principle in the relation between 'society' and the 'State,' between 'politics' and 'economics' between the 'administration of people' and the 'administration of things.' In such conditions the development of productive forces and the victorious course of the class struggle systematically prepare the transition to the swallowing up of the political functions of the State in administrative and economic functions, *i.e.*, the transition to classless and Stateless communist society . . .

"Marx and Engels also approached the problem of the dying away of the State from the aspect of an analysis of the State as a parasitic growth on the social body. The sharper the class contradictions, the stronger the centrifugal forces splitting the relative unity of society, the larger is the State apparatus (the army, civil service, etc.), the more immense are the non-productive expenses on it, the real *faux frais* of exploiting social formations. The State is transformed into a force which stands above society, divided off from it, growing disproportionately even from the point of view of its own functions.

"This peculiar hypertrophy of the State apparatus and its extreme bureaucratization, this existence over society and those forces standing outside society, these monstrous non-productive expenses, which arise out of the features of a specific (exploiting) social formation and are multiplied by the growth of its inner contradictions, are destroyed in the first place and in this destruction are already to be found the germs of the surmounting of the State."

³² *Civil War in France*. Introduction by Engels, p. 19.

universal suffrage. They were responsible to the electors and revocable at short terms. All officials and public servants under the Commune, including the police, magistrates and judges, were 'elective, responsible and revocable.' Further, the public service had to be done at '*workmen's wages*' (italics Marx's)³³. These wages were not high; the highest salary, says Marx 'barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to a high scientific authority, is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain metropolitan school-board'³⁴. Now if no official is paid more than 'workmen's wages,' if all offices at the same time are 'elective, responsible and revocable,' office is deprived of any flavour of political power or repressive authority. Privilege and class distinctions totally disappear, and the State may quietly 'fall asleep'. Administration of things replaces political dominion³⁵.

33 *Civil War in France*, p. 40. 34 *Ibid.* p. 45.

35 Bureaucracy naturally 'wither away' with the State. Lenin says (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 47-48):—*We ourselves*, the workers, will organize large-scale production on the basis of what capitalism has already created; we shall rely on our own experience as workers, we shall establish strict, iron discipline supported by the State power of the armed workers, we shall reduce the role of the State officials to that of simply carrying out our instructions as responsible, revocable, moderately paid 'managers' (of course, with the aid of technicians of all sorts, types and degrees). This is *our* proletarian task, this is what we can and must *start* with in carrying out the proletarian revolution. Such a beginning, on the basis of large-scale production, will of itself lead to the gradual 'withering away' of all bureaucracy, to the gradual creation of an order, order without quotation marks, which will be different from wage-slavery, an order in which the functions of control and accounting—becoming more and more simple—will be performed by each in turn, will then become a habit and will finally die out as the *special* functions of a special stratum of the population.

"A witty German Social-Democrat of the seventies of the last century called the *post-office* an example of the socialist system. This is very true. At present the post-office is a business organised on the

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

The State is a grand institution. Perhaps the reader is shedding tears over its 'dying out.' The grief is pointless. The State must go. An inexorable dialectic has pronounced the doom of the State.

We begin with a state of things in which there is no strong central authority. The State gradually emerges, the negation of the no-State. This is an advance as compared with the preceding chaotic condition in which local chieftans are constantly fighting for supremacy. But the negation must produce its own negation. The State negates itself or disappears. But we do not return to the primitive chaos where every man's hand is turned against every one else. A higher form of society (*a*²) emerges, enriched by

lines of a State *capitalist* monopoly. Imperialism is gradually transforming all trusts into organizations of a similar type. Over the 'common' toilers, who are overworked and starved, there stands the same bourgeois bureaucracy. But the mechanism of social management is here already to hand. Overthrow the capitalists, crush the resistance of these exploiters with the iron hand of the armed workers, smash the bureaucratic machine of the modern State—and you will have a mechanism of the highest technical equipment, free from the 'parasite,' capable of being wielded by the united workers themselves, who will hire their own technicians, managers and book-keepers, and pay them *all*, as, indeed *every* 'State' official, ordinary workmen's wages. Here is a concrete, practicable task, immediately possible of fulfilment in relation to all trusts, a task that frees the toilers from exploitation and takes into account what the Commune had already begun to carry out (particularly in the field of State construction).

"Our immediate object is to organize the *whole* of national economy on the lines of the postal system, so that the technicians, managers, book-keepers, as well as *all* officials, shall receive salaries no higher than 'workmen's wages,' all under the control and leadership of the armed proletariat. It is such a State, standing on such an economic basis, that we need. This is what will bring about the abolition of parliamentarism and the preservation of representative institutions. This is what will rid the labouring classes of the prostitution of these institutions by the bourgeoisie."

The reader should note that Lenin would give '*all* officials' (*italics* Lenin's) 'ordinary workmen's wages.'

MARXISM IS DEAD

two-thousand years of political and economic experience and inexorable dialectical reasoning.

Not only is the destruction of the State a dialectical process, but class-war itself is grounded in inexorable dialectic. Let no one suppose that capitalism can be transformed into communism by slow and gradual or evolutionary changes. This is a passage of quantity into quality, and in physical science such passage takes place by 'jerks.' Revolutions are therefore inevitable³⁶. The *History of the Communist Party* thus instructs us :

"Further, if the passing of slow quantitative changes into rapid and abrupt qualitative changes is a law of development, then it is clear that revolutions made by oppressed classes are a quite natural and inevitable phenomenon.

"Hence the transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capitalism cannot be effected by slow changes, by reforms, but only by a qualitative change of the capitalist system, by revolution

"Hence in order not to err in policy, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.

"Further, if development proceeds by way of the disclosure of internal contradictions, by way of collisions, then it is clear that the class-struggle of the proletariat is a quite natural and inevitable phenomenon.

"Hence we must not cover up the contradictions of the capitalist system, but disclose and unravel them ; we must not try to check the class-struggle but carry it to its conclusion.

"Hence, in order not to err in policy, one must pursue an uncompromising proletarian class policy, not a reformist policy of harmony of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, not a compromisers' policy of 'the growing of capitalism into socialism.' "

Such is the famous Marxian dialectical method when applied to social life, to the history of society.

³⁶ *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, Moscow, 1939, p. 111.

NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

This is not dialectical materialism but dialectical bullooney. This is not scientific socialism but scientific drivel. What makes it so is one single fact consistently ignored by communists—the Darwinian struggle for existence.

The struggle for existence is not confined to the boundaries of a single country. It is world-wide.

“The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class-struggles,” declares the *Communist Manifesto*. There is no recognition in the *Communist Manifesto* of the terrible struggle for existence among nations before which the class-struggle pales into insignificance.

If we fix our attention on a single country such as England, and ignore its relations with the outside world, then the whole process of ‘becoming’ may be interpreted as a struggle for power between the different classes living in the country. The proletariat, by seizing power, can establish its own dictatorship. The bourgeoisie is wiped out of existence. Then, a classless society having been brought into existence, the political functions of the State may be replaced by simple administrative functions, all offices may be made elective, responsible and revocable, every one from the highest to the lowest may be paid *workmen's wages*—and the State may disappear. If the administrative machinery worked inefficiently, all would be poor and miserable but in an equal degree. This is a real classless society without the repressive machinery called the State.

But all talk of the withering away of the State or of establishing a classless society through class-war, though founded on an inexorable dialectic, is just nonsense—it ignores the external factor. In a world divided into

MARXISM IS DEAD

independent nations, with unequal resources and unequal opportunities for expansion, treading the path of civil war means death and destruction for any country. As we shall see later, there is abundant material for class-war in the Soviet Union. Class-war or civil-strife is smouldering in Russia. If it flares up openly. Russia will 'inevitably' break up. Let the Russian State which according to all principles of dialectic, should have started 'withering away' long ago, actually 'wither away' or 'fall asleep.' Russia will 'inevitably' break up. Every one is not paid *workmen's wages* in Russia. Soviet officials, civil and military, are not elected and revocable. Let Russia follow Marx. Russia will 'inevitably' break up.

It may be incredible, but the external factor is a governing factor in the history of any country. And the history of India is not the history of internal class-struggles, due to the 'mode of production,' but from beginning to end, a history of foreign conquest, or of the external factor.

CHAPTER IV

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

A utopia may be defined as an unrealizable dream. A 'scientific' utopia would seem to be a contradiction in terms. But if inexorable dialectic leads us to a form of society which must ever remain a dream, our utopia is 'scientific' in spite of the contradiction.

There are two main utopian elements in 'scientific' socialism, (i) abolition of the rule of violence and enthronement of non-violence as the governing principle in human relations, and (ii) abolition of nationality and the establishment of a world State or system for the realization of the aims of communism.

The ultimate victory of non-violence is founded on negation of the negation.

What was the condition of primitive man? Did he live in a state of continual war with his fellow men? If so, the original violence and confusion were negated by the emergence of an ordered, peaceful society. Negation of the negation would mean reversion to the original state of war.

But this is impossible. It is obvious that we started with a wrong premiss. The original condition of man was not that of war but peace. Life then was not 'nasty, brutish, short,' but idyllic—a state of long uninterrupted bliss. In short, we begin with *satyuga* and *Ramraj*.

Satyuga was negated by *kaliyuga*, or non-violence by violence. Violence begets its own negation. *Kaliyuga* will be negated by a form of *satyuga* which will be a thou-

MARXISM IS DEAD

sand times more happy and more peaceful than the *satyuga* of tradition.

Thus we reach the conception of a non-violent society through negation of the negation.

I doubt if Mahatma Gandhi has ever heard of negation of the negation. His utopia is unscientific.

In 1938 there broke out a series of communal riots in the United Provinces which were suppressed by the Congress Ministry of that Province with the help of the police and the military. Mahatma Gandhi unequivocally condemned the use of violence by the Congress Ministry. *Goondas*, too, are our countrymen. "If they will kill us, we must allow them to do so," said Mahatma Gandhi.

In Mahatma Gandhi's utopia no violence will be committed by man against man. If any *goondas* are left in this ideal state of affairs, they will be allowed to kill honest folk. I can imagine an exponent of non-violence saying to a *goonda* in the *satyuga* to come: "You want to kidnap my little girl? I have another at home. Kidnap both." Or: "It will give you pleasure to burn down my house? You may burn down the whole street. All of us in this street are completely non-violent. And our non-violence is not non-violence of the weak, but that of the bravest of the brave."

Or have we misunderstood Mahatma Gandhi? Does he permit one to commit violence as a measure of self-defence against unjust aggression? If he does, then it is not my duty to allow myself to be killed by *goondas*, but to knock *goondas* on the head. And since an individual, on account of physical weakness, or other circumstances, may not be able to defend himself, it is the duty of the

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

State to use the police and the military for the protection of law-abiding citizens.

Mahatma Gandhi is not a communist. But sometimes extremes meet.

How is it possible for a communist to preach non-violence? Communists believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, and dictatorship necessarily implies coercion by force of the minority by the majority.

Dictatorship of the proletariat, the communist replies, is only a transitional state. This is the first phase of communism. In this first phase, called socialism, a workers' democracy replaces the rule of the capitalist class. But even a workers' democracy is not the communist's ideal. "Democracy," says Lenin, "is a *state* which recognizes the subordination of the minority to the majority, *i.e.*, an organization for the systematic use of *violence* by one class against the other, by one section of people against another."¹ Under communism there will be no violence at all, no coercion, no repression of any one by any one else. Democracy must therefore be overcome. And since democracy is a form of State, the State itself must disappear, so that the rule of non-violence is established. Lenin goes on :

"We set ourselves the ultimate aim of abolishing the State, *i.e.*, all organized and systematic violence, all use of violence against man in general. We do not expect the advent of an order of society in which the principle of the subordination of the minority to the majority will not be observed. But in striving for socialism we are convinced that it will develop into communism and hence,

¹ *State and Revolution*, by Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 75.

that the need for violence against people in general, the need for the *subjection* of one man to another, and of one section of the population to another, will vanish, since people will *become accustomed* to observing the elementary conditions of social life *without force* and *without subordination* " (italics Lenin's). ²

A difference between Mahatma Gandhi and Lenin will be immediately noticed. According to Lenin, non-violence will prevail when socialism develops into communism—not before. In fact, the whole process of uprooting the old order and building the new in Russia has been marked by extreme violence. Mahatma Gandhi imagines that since the Congress stands for non-violence and since Congressmen have assumed the responsibilities of office, the stage has already been reached when the police and the military can be dispensed with ! The communist trusts that human nature will be transformed by socialism, so that, as society progress towards the communist ideal, violence will *with away*. According to communists, then, there is no question of a sudden transition from the first to the second phase of socialism, or from socialism to communism, or from violence to non-violence. According to Mahatma Gandhi, first, the transition is sudden, or of the shortest possible duration, and second, it is not dependent on the transformation of human nature through economic changes. Not long ago the British Government maintained law and order with the help of the police and the military, but a new era dawned with the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy. Therefore, non-violence must

² Lenin, loc. cit., p. 75.

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

prevail. If Congress Ministers rely on force and violence for maintaining law and order, as did the British Government, then the Congress has lost and the British have won ! The mere assumption of office by Congressmen in seven Provinces has spiritually regenerated mankind in these Provinces ! How ? one would like to know. But it is the privilege of great men to say things which common mortals are unable to grasp.

My difficulty in understanding the communist utopia of non-violence is not less but greater. Mahatma Gandhi's utopia is religious, for he works by intuition, or, let us say, Divine inspiration. The outlook of the communist is non-religious, if not irreligious. In formulating his conception of the society of the future, the communist seeks the aid of logic, of dialectical materialism, not Divine inspiration.

"We are not utopians," protests Lenin.³ A utopian indulges in idle fancies and dreams. This is not the point of view of the communist. He studies the law of motion of capitalist society, and deduces therefrom the inevitable transformation of capitalism into communism. The future form of communism can be predicted since communism has its origin in capitalism, since it develops historically from capitalism, and since it is the result of social forces inherent in capitalism. Lenin says :

"There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to conjure up a utopia, to make idle guesses about what cannot be known. Marx treats the question of communism as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of, say, a new biological species, if he knew that such and such was its origin and such and such the

3 Lenin, loc. cit., p. 77.

MARXISM IS DEAD

direction in which it was changing.”⁴

The central idea of Marxian dialectic is that economic development takes place according to law. At a certain stage the development of forces of production transforms feudalism into capitalism, but economic development does not cease with this change. The historical process reveals a continual struggle of opposites, a perpetual succession of forms. Capitalism inevitably leads to greater and greater socialization of production and labour, and thus gives birth to the class-struggle. The class-struggle can end only in one way, through the abolition of classes and the establishment of a class-less society. Communism is therefore seen as “the inevitable result of the development of the productive forces of modern society.”⁵

When socialism has inevitably developed into communism, or a class-less society, the State withers away. The possibility and inevitability of excesses on the part of *individual persons* is admitted, and also the need for suppressing such excesses.⁶ But for this no special machine, no special apparatus of repression is required—that is, the police and the military disappear. The armed people itself will suppress such excesses. When we see two people fighting in the streets, we separate them, *i.e.*, we do not invoke the aid of the police. Secondly, argues Lenin, “the fundamental social cause of excesses, which consist in violating the rules of social life, is the exploitation of the masses, their want and poverty. With the

⁴ Lenin, loc. cit., p. 77.

⁵ Marx, Engels, *Marxism* by Lenin (International Publishers, New York), p. 35.

⁶ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 83.

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

removal of this chief cause, excesses will inevitably begin to *wither away*. We do not know how quickly and in what order, but we know that they will wither away. With their withering away, the State will also wither away." ⁷

The withering away of the State is no empty phrase. As we have seen, Marx and Engels rejected the State quite as definitely and emphatically as the anarchists. The criticism of the Gotha programme by Marx and Engels is significant (a).

Marx and Engels laughed at the "fantastic pictures of future society" painted by the utopians who preceded them (St. Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen and others). They talked of socialist colonies ('all these castles in the air') with open contempt. And yet their own conception of future society, which they built on a foundation of

⁷ Lenin, loc. cit., p. 83.

(a) Marx wrote: "The question now arises: what change will the form of the State undergo in communist society? In other words, what social functions will remain then still in existence analogous to the functions now performed by the State? The question can only be considered scientifically and no nearer approach to the problem can be made by a thousand times repeated conjunction of the word 'people' and the word 'State' than by the hop of a flea." (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 44).

Engels wrote to Bebel in 1875: "The people's free State has been transformed into a free State. According to the grammatical meaning of the words, the free State is one in which the State is free in relation to its citizens, i.e., a State with a despotic government. It would be well to throw overboard all this chatter about the State, especially after the Commune, which was no longer a State in the proper sense of the word. The anarchists have too long thrown this 'people's State' into our teeth, although already in Marx's work against Proudhon, and then in the *Communist Manifesto*, it was stated definitely that with the introduction of the Socialist order of society the State will dissolve of itself (*sich auflöst*) and disappear." (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*, pp. 57-8.)

MARXISM IS DEAD

logic and immutable law, is not less fantastic than that of the most utopian of utopian socialists.

THE INTERNAL PROBLEM

The non-violent utopia of Mahatma Gandhi, as that of communists, has two aspects—internal and external. The internal aspect relates to the maintenance of law and order within a country, and the external to national defence against foreign aggression.

Non-violence or *ahimsa* is not a new creed. It is a part of Hindu religion. The orthodox Hindu believes in *ahimsa* today as he did in the past. But Mahatma Gandhi deserves credit for making *ahimsa* a political weapon for achieving freedom.

In 1927, while in Holland, the present writer spent a great deal of time and labour in translating into English a manuscript account of the trade and inhabitants of the western coast of India by a Dutch factor, W. Geleynssen De Jongh. De Jongh was in the service of the Dutch East India Company. He came to our India at the end of 1621, and was promoted to the rank of head factor (*opper-coopman*) in 1623. From 1623 to 1632 he served at Burhanpur and later, till 1640, as assistant director at Broach and Surat.

De Jongh got to know the people among whom he lived and worked, and he was a careful observer. His account of the western coast is of more than special interest. He wrote the whole of it in 1625, except the concluding portion, which was added in 1631. The manuscript was edited by the late Prof. Caland, the well-known Sanskrit scholar, in 1928, and published in

1929.¹

De Jongh has a great deal to say about the philosophy, manners and customs of "De Benjanen" (*banias*) of the western coast. He uses this term to indicate Hindus of the commercial caste, and often Hindus in general. He thus describes the *ahimsa* of De Benjanen :

"*Banias*, who live in the largest numbers in this town (Cambay), as has been said before, are the most kind-hearted of all peoples who live in the Province of Gujrat. They are much interested in poor people, give much alms to the needy, secure the release of many people who are captured by their enemies or robbers, and help many who are reduced to poverty or are oppressed by the ruler. It is not only poor men who are the objects of their charity, but all animals in general, for they have a hospital (*pinjrapole*) where injured or sick beasts are taken care of—birds as well as four-footed animals—until they recover. Then they take the birds into the forest and let them fly away. Similarly, when four-footed animals are cured of their diseases, they set them free in places where they can live free and out of reach of man's power, so that they are not caught again by hunters, who are not so kind-hearted as the *Banias*. When any Moor or Rajput, who have not the same scruples about killing animals, captures one and takes it to a *bania*, threatening to kill it, if its price and more were not paid, the *bania* immediately buys it and pays more for it than it is worth, rather than let it be killed. If any one is too poor to pay the price himself, he asks others to

¹ *De Remonstrantie van W. Gelevnsen De Jongh*. The Hague, 1929.

MARXISM IS DEAD

contribute, until the sum required to satisfy the seller is found. Having bought the animal, they set it free or let it fly away. The religion of these *banias* does not permit them to kill anything that has life, much less to eat the abomination others have killed. They say that their religion forbids them to kill anything that has life—only He may kill who gave life. They also say that all animals, without any exception, possess a soul like man, though man is a nobler creation than cattle or birds. Therefore, it does not become man to kill any of these creatures; only God may do so, whom they call *Ram Ram* or *Permisser*.”²

This account, written more than 300 years ago, faithfully describes the creed of *ahimsa* of orthodox Hindus even of today. Probably three hundred years ago there were more orthodox Hindus than at present, but the meaning of *ahimsa*, or the reasons for it have not changed.

Ahimsa is a noble creed from the ethical standpoint, but, as a State policy, it may not be successful in maintaining law and order. In a later passage De Jongh thus explains why the roads were not safe for travellers: (b)

“The reason why the roads are unsafe is that they are daily used by *bania* and heathen merchants, who travel with their goods but take few or no armed guards with

² *Remonstrantie*, pp. 34-5.

(b) In quaint 17th century Dutch this interesting passage reads :

“Want dese coopluysden liever haer goedren missen als yemant (hoewel thaer vijanden zijn) soude dooden, twelck dese dieven ofte wechrovers wel weten ; dat soo den handel niet als door Mooren ofte Cristenen gadreven ende de wegen door haer bereijst werden, men soo veel gedieften niet ontmoeten soude als nu doen, want de Mooren ofte Mogollen (soo wel als de Cristenen) liever doot soude vechten als hear goederen van struijkrovers laten nemen.” Ibid. p. 44.

them. The robbers attack them without hesitation and take what they please. For these merchants would rather lose their goods than kill any one (even their enemy), which these thieves or robbers know very well. If trade were carried on by Moors and Christians alone, and they alone used the roads for travelling, so many robberies would not be committed as at present, for Moors or Mughals (as also Christians) would rather die fighting than be robbed of their goods."

If I were Congress President, I would ask every Congressman to commit this passage to memory and recite it daily ten times in the morning on rising from bed, and ten times at night before retiring to bed.

Suppose I am waylaid by a robber on a dark night. And I say to him: "I have taken the vow of non-violence. You may therefore take what I have. I will not offer resistance." I allow myself to be robbed. According to Mahatma Gandhi, if *goondas* will kill us, we should allow ourselves to be killed. It follows that if *goondas* will rob us, we should allow ourselves to be robbed. For if non-violence is something more important than life, it is much more important than money or goods.

Well, I return from my heroic adventure and tell you about it. You praise my non-violence as non-violence of the bravest of the brave, garland me and take me round in a procession!

Think of Muhammadans and *banias* of the western coast 300 years ago. Which of the two possessed more courage: *banias* or exponents of non-violence who, in the words of De Jongh "would rather lose their goods than kill any one (even their enemy)" or Muhammadans who "would rather die fighting than be robbed of their goods"?

MARXISM IS DEAD

There is an old Sanskrit saying, *bhubhukshita kim na karoti papam*, or there is no sin which a starving man does not commit. Poverty is not the only cause of excesses committed by evil-doers, but it is the most important cause.

Suppose poverty were abolished. Would the rule of non-violence be firmly established then?

There would be fewer excesses committed than at present. But still the police and the military could not be dispensed with. For the abolition of poverty does not mean equality in the distribution of wealth. If individual wealth and incomes are unequal, the danger of crimes against property would remain. The form of property is immaterial. In a socialist society property in instruments of production is abolished. People will not fight about land, tools and implements. But there are a thousand other desirable things besides capital goods, which you may possess on account of your larger income and I may not. A socialist society offers considerable scope for the predatory activities of thieves and robbers. A socialist society, therefore, cannot dispense with the police and the military.

But the police and the military become superfluous under communism. Why? Because a communist society has neither money nor individual property. All the wealth produced is piled up in common stores, from which any one may take whatever he requires for personal consumption. All work according to their capacity and consume according to their needs.

In such a society there will be no police required to catch thieves. For there will be no thefts committed. We assume that the productive forces of the community

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

have increased so enormously that there is a superabundance of all goods. Why should any one attempt to steal anything when he can have it for the mere asking from the common store ?

The communist utopia is a most desirable utopia. One dreams of it—that is, of a state of things in which one would be permitted to work when one felt inclined to do so, and to consume according to one's needs. One dreams of a palace with 100 acres of ground attached to it ; of rooms decorated with Persian carpets, the rarest paintings and valuable furniture ; of luxurious cars ; of the finest Havanas ; of sparkling wines, and of many other good things.

Not to speak of palaces, carpets, luxurious cars, Havanas and sparkling wines, superabundance and free distribution of even the necessities of life (food, clothing and shelter) is impossible. We may also remember that human wants are indefinitely extensible and that the luxuries of yesterday tend to become the necessities of today.

Where a superabundance of objects of human consumption does not exist, both money and the wage system must be retained, which means that there is no 'free utilization' of goods³. The inequality of wages, paid in money, limits the consumption of those earning less, thus equating supply and demand. (This is also the explanation of the charge made by Mahatma Gandhi for his autograph. He would otherwise be continually signing his name, and have little time for anything else.)

SOVIET RUSSIA

There are many Marxists in India who have not read Marx. And there are many admirers of 'Soviet

³ *Anti-Duehring*. by F. Engels, p. 342.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Communism' (!) in India who do not understand the meaning of recent changes in Soviet economy, or deliberately misinterpret them.

Marxism is inconsistent with a money economy and payment of wages according to progressive piece-rates. In a Marxist society there are no commodities and no value. Where there is 'free utilization of the resources of society,' value, commodities, money, exchange and markets do not exist. Now in Soviet Russia value, expressed in terms of money, has the same meaning as in any capitalist country; the market has been fully restored; rationing, or payment of wages in kind, has been completely suppressed; and there is the same scale of prices for all.

Perhaps the critical reader would argue that the present Soviet system is a stage in the development of Marxist economy. It is nothing of the kind. Russia is not marching toward any Marxist goal. She has definitely turned her back on Marxism.

There was a time when it was possible to speak of a Marxist Russia. Her object then was to abolish money, to naturalize wages. It is estimated that in the spring of 1920 payments in kind by the State met at least half of the needs of the workers, and M. Larin, a high Soviet official, spoke with enthusiasm of the distribution of products of social labour among workers in accordance with their needs⁴. Where is M. Larin now? He is dead. He was executed by the Soviet Government as a traitor.

Bucharin regarded the use of money in the Soviet

⁴ See my *Indian Socialism*, p. 123.

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

system as a transitory phenomenon. Explaining the programme of the Bolsheviks in 1919 he said:

"Just at present the Workers' Government requires money and requires it very much, because the regulation of the system of production and distribution is just beginning, and money at present has a most important role. But one must consider that the importance of money tends to decline in proportion as the organization of production in accordance with labour principles improves. A great deal of time is required for organizing, regulating everything. It is new work, never before attempted anywhere in the world and therefore particularly difficult. But one thing is clear: the better workers are able to control production, the smaller would become the need for money, and in the end money would gradually die out completely" (*und schliesslich wird das Geld allmählich ganz aussterben*). ⁶

Like a good Marxist Bucharin was opposed to a money economy. Where is Bucharin? Dead—he was executed as a traitor.

Speaking in 1919 the communist Krestinski, who then represented the Soviet Government in Germany, said: "No one doubts that there will be no money in a communist society. Money would be abolished; we shall open a new page of a money-less economy" (*wir werden eine neue Seite eines geldlosen volkswirtschaftlichen Verkehrs aufschlagen*). ⁷

⁶ *Kann das Geld abgeschafft werden*, by A. W. Cohn (Jena, 1920), p. 58.

⁷ *Der Geldverkehr in Sowjetrussland*, by A. P. Markoff (Bernard and Graefe, Berlin), p. 1.

Where is M Krestinski? Dead. He was executed by Stalin with Bucharin and others as a traitor.

To establish a money-less economy a series of decrees were issued in Soviet Russia in 1920 and the first half of 1921. On January 26, 1921, a new unit for measuring value was created. This was called 'Tred.' It was a labour unit, representing a normal day of ordinary labour, involving normal strain ⁸.

Where is the 'Tred' now? It is gone, but money has come back.

V. I. Mezhlauk, Chairman of the State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R., thus explained in January, 1936, the function of the rouble in the Soviet system :

"With the abolition of the card system, the rapid elimination of payments in kind and the abolition of two sets and even three sets of prices as the monetary system developed, the rouble is becoming the sole and effective means for the realization of the socialist principle of payment for labour." ⁹

In concluding his speech Mezhlauk paid his tribute of admiration to Stalin, and exhorted his audience in the following words : "Let us march on toward the glowing dawn of communist society." There was a storm of applause and the whole audience rose. The Soviet march toward the glowing dawn of communist society is illusory. If Soviet Russia were really marching toward that glorious dawn, Larin, Bucharin and many other leading communists would have been leading the van, not lying in their graves. And it is a little difficult for a

⁸ *Die Russische Waehrungsreform des Jahres, 1924.* by Dr. H. J. Scraphim, p. 14 (Teubner, Berlin and Leipzig), 1925.

⁹ *Soviet Union, 1936* (Lawrence and Wishart), pp. 387-88.

person of average intelligence to understand how the same money economy, which was rejected in 1920 as contrary to Marxism, can now be used as an instrument for the realization of Marxist aims. Is this a joke or what ?

To summarise :—

1. It is indisputable that non-violence is the highest ethical ideal.

2. But this ideal can be realized only in a type of society which can never be established on earth.

3. Ignoring, for the moment, the struggle for existence among different nations, and concentrating attention on the internal problem, we find that inequality of incomes and wealth is one of the most important causes of excesses committed by individuals, for the suppression of which violence is used.

4. Communism will remove this inequality, but communism assumes "free utilization of the resources of society," possible only when there is a super-abundance of goods.

5. This super-abundance is an unrealizable dream.

6. Therefore a money economy must be retained.

7. Russia attempted to abolish money but failed.

8. Where wages are paid in money, and there are differences in wages, the distinction between the rich and the poor exists.

9. Such a society—it is immaterial whether it is socialist, capitalist or fascist—must possess engines of repression, the police and the military, and use them in the interest of law and order.

MARXISM IS DEAD

THE EXTERNAL PROBLEM

Mahatma Gandhi visited the Frontier in 1938. In the course of a speech there he thus referred to the tribal problem :

“ We must initiate these brave people into adopting the creed of non-violence and make them braver still.”

Who will carry Mahatma Gandhi's noble message to the tribesmen ? Who will undertake to make them non-violent and braver still ? Mahatma Gandhi himself cannot be spared for this work, nor the Frontier Gandhi. Let us suppose that the tribesmen discover a leader of their own to initiate them into the creed of non-violence. How long would he take to transform violent, daring raiders into a non-violent, peace-loving people ?

The answer is ‘ Infinity,’ unless, by a miracle, he was able to convert bleak mountains of the tribal territory into fertile plains, yielding an abundance of food and other produce.

But I may be mistaken. If non-violence and the *charkha* are accepted by the tribesmen, we may live to see the curious spectacle of brave men, who have become braver still, laying aside their guns and spending their entire time in producing yarn and praising the Lord !

But suppose they came to know that in the neighbouring country India, the inhabitants, having won their independence and having completely realized the ideal of non-violence in thought, speech and action, had disbanded the police and the military. What would happen ? The tribesmen would burn their *charkhas* and overrun the Punjab. If we were truly and sincerely non-violent, a handful of invaders might conquer the whole of India and

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

settle down to rule the country (c).

This, in essence is the history of India during the past 1,000 years.

British rule in India is regarded as a miracle. But Muhammadan rule was a far greater miracle. The Muhammadan invaders were a handful, as compared with the teeming Hindu population, but they founded and ruled over large Empires at a time when there were neither such rapid means of communication and transportation, nor such fearful engines of destruction as assist Imperialism today. A thousand years ago it was a fight of man against man, not of man against machines. The Hindus far outnumbered the foreign invaders, but they lost. Why? You will say that they were divided amongst themselves. But much more destructive than their dis-

(c) It must be said to the credit of Mahatma Gandhi that his message to the entire world is the same as that to India or the tribal people. In the course of an interview granted on March 23, 1939, to Mr. F. E. Birchall, the special correspondent of the *New York Times*, Mahatma Gandhi said: "I see from today's paper that the British Prime Minister is conferring with other democratic Powers as to how they should meet the latest threatening developments. How I wish he was conferring by proposing to them that all should resort to simultaneous disarmament! I am certain as I am sitting here that this heroic act would open Herr Hitler's eyes and disarm him.

" 'Would not that be a miracle?' " The correspondent asked. "Perhaps, but it would save the world from butchery that seems to be impending." The Mahatma declined to add more. "Is not that enough for one morning?" he asked.

More than enough, we say, not only for one morning but for all time.

Mahatma Gandhi at first hesitated to give his message to the world. He said: "I don't see at the moment an atmosphere which would carry my voice to all nations. Perhaps I am far in advance of the times."

He is right. He lives in the *satyuga* of the very, very remote future.

MARXISM IS DEAD

union was their view of life, which restricted fighting to a particular caste, thus turning three-fourths of adult males into non-violently brave but passive spectators of defeat, disaster and ruin.

The position of a non-violent country in the midst of others which are not non-violent is extremely dangerous.

Communism can never succeed except on an international scale. Why? Because in this wicked world if any socialist State started withering away, it would be attacked and absorbed by the neighbouring capitalist States which had not withered away. No State can wither away unless all States simultaneously begin to wither away.

Marx and Engels interpreted history in terms of the class-struggle, and Lenin viewed Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. Since the class-struggle is an integral part of capitalism, it follows that Imperialism is also a phase of the class-struggle.

The Marxist has no use for the Darwinian struggle for existence. There is an important difference between the two theories. The class-struggle leads to internationalism: the interests of the workers of the world are identical. Hence the slogan: 'Workers of the world, unite.' The world proletariat rises in revolt against the world bourgeoisie and, putting an end to world capitalism, establishes a world communist society. National barriers disappear; the different peoples live together as one family of workers, acquire a common culture and speak the same language.

The struggle for existence recognizes no community of interests between different peoples. It reveals a state

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

of relentless and unending war. History is a record of this war.

The interests of British and Indian workers are not identical. If Britain lost India, the British worker would grow poorer.

The interests of the German or Japanese proletariat on the one hand and those of the Russian proletariat on the other are not identical. The population of Russia in 1931 exceeded the combined population of Germany and Japan by about 20 per cent, but Russia owns about 20 times as much territory as Germany and Japan put together.

Only 15.6 per cent of the area of Japan is arable. It would be absurd for any one to maintain that socialism, without the Japanese Empire, would raise the standard of living of the Japanese worker.

The standard of living of German workers would rise if Germany acquired some of Russian territory, *e.g.*, the Ukraine.

More territory means more land for peasants, more raw materials for industries, a larger home market, greater production, and higher wages. The workers share in Imperialist loot.

Mahatma Gandhi has predicted that Mussolini and Hitler "are bound to end in a clash and that would be the end of them. But nations which adopt the doctrine of non-violence would emerge much stronger in the end." We are not interested in the fate of Mussolini and Hitler. But it is probable that when Mussolini and Hitler have ended, new Mussolinis and Hitlers would arise, until there is a more equal distribution of the

MARXISM IS DEAD

world's resources among the great Powers.

Like the communists Mahatma Gandhi is unaware of the struggle for existence!

In the struggle for existence the fittest survives. And 'fittest' does not mean 'the most non-violent' or 'the most highly evolved spiritually.' No Empire was ever founded on truth and non-violence. So far from emerging 'much stronger in the end,' nations which adopt the creed of non-violence are destined to be destroyed.

We are really not concerned with Europe. What is the interpretation of Indian history?

The interpretation is not in terms of non-violence. Can we interpret Indian history in terms of the class-struggle?

The history of India may be divided, roughly, into three periods, (i) pre-Muhammadan, ending with the second battle of Traori (1194), which gave the throne of Delhi to the Slave Kings; (ii) Muhammadan, which ended in 1757 with the victory of Clive at Plassey, and (iii) British, since 1757.

Powerful empires existed in India in the pre-Muhammadan period. Reference may be particularly made to the vast empire of Asoka which comprised Afghanistan south of the Hindu Kush, Baluchistan, Sind, the Valley of Kashmir, Nepal, the lower Himalayas and the whole of India Proper, except the southern extremity.

We have, in the first period, wars between independent States in India, and also foreign invasions. Alexander's invasion did not change India, but Muhammad-bin-Qasim's invasion of Sind (711 A.D.) and the raiding expeditions of Mahmud Ghaznavi (1001-1024) heralded the Muhammadan conquest.

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

Class antagonisms existed in ancient India. The Shudras were the most oppressed class. History, however, does not record any general uprising of Shudras against caste-Hindus.

But it is impossible not to notice the conflict of religions, Hinduism against Buddhism. Buddhism triumphed over Hinduism for four centuries, from 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. In the second century A.D. Brahminical religion again began to win popular favour; the Gupta emperors in the fourth century were 'zealous Hindus.'

Alexander's invasion was inspired by military ambition; it has no other significance. But Mahmud Ghaznavi's raids have a deeper meaning. Two new motives come into play in our history, *tabligh* and loot.

From 1206, in which year Qutab-ud-Din Aibek, the first Slave King, ascended the throne of Delhi, to 1857, we have a regular succession of Muhammadan rulers, the Slave Kings (1206-1290) the Khiljis (1290-1320), the Tughlaks (1320-1414), the Saadat (1414-1450), the Lodhis (1451-1526) and, finally, the Moghuls (1526-1857). During this whole period there are internal wars and also invasions from across the North-West Frontier (Timur 1398, Babar 1526, Nadir Shah 1739 and Ahmad Shah Abdali 1756). When Muhammadan is fighting against Muhammadan, a foreign invasion is not explained by proselytising zeal; the desire for loot becomes the dominant motive. But the religious factor is not wholly absent, as is shown by the wars of Moghul Kings with Rajputs, the rise of the Mahratta power in the Deccan, and the conquest of the Punjab by the Sikhs.

What evidence for the class-struggle as the dominant

MARXISM IS DEAD

force in history is furnished by the Muhammadan period? None whatsoever. It is possible for a teacher of Indian history to lecture on the Muhammadan period for years without once mentioning the class-struggle. Our history is not like British history—in England one may trace the development of political institutions, the growth of popular liberty. In India there was no movement of the common people to wrest economic or political power from their rulers. The common people did not count for much.

There was exploitation of the worker by the non-worker under the Moghuls. The nobles lived in luxury; peasants and hand-workers were poor, though it is certain that they got more to eat then than they do now. The worker was the victim of bureaucratic exploitation. He might have made history by revolting against the bureaucrats, who were mostly of foreign origin. But he did not; he quietly submitted to his destiny.

The British conquest introduced a new, moral factor in our history. The Muhammadan invader, whether he came just for loot, or as a conquerer who settled down to govern the country, was not actuated by philanthropic motives. The British conquest, on the contrary, represented a civilizing influence. Led by the Invisible Hand, Britain defeated her European rivals and won India for the good of India. The same Invisible Hand has led Mussolini to Abyssinia. Italians have become responsible for the moral and material progress of Ethiopians in the same sense in which the British are responsible for our moral and material progress.

Was the British conquest of India of the nature of a class-struggle? Not more than the rise to power of the

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

Slave Kings, Khiljis, Lodhis or the Moghuls.

It is evident that if all history is merely a series of class-struggles, India has no history at all !

Our history, if we have one, has a totally different content.

There is a 'being' and a 'becoming' in English history, a change of forms, both economic and political. In Indian history 'being' and 'becoming' is largely the being and becoming of despots, ending with the most mighty of them all, the British Viceroy. There is no change of forms, except those of warring despots.

We are forced to recognize that a country's history contains two elements, internal and external. Within a country there may be a struggle for power among different organized classes—this struggle is the class-struggle proper. But in certain cases, as that of India, the external factor is of far greater significance. This external factor arises out of the struggle for existence. A country that is rich in natural resources, but is politically weak and defenceless, is constantly exposed to the danger of foreign invasion and conquest. The history of India is largely the history of foreign rule. The struggle with the foreign invader in our case completely overshadows internal class conflicts.

A WORLD SOCIALIST ECONOMY

It may be admitted that a world socialist economy will solve all the contradictions of capitalism. The growth of capitalism in a single country is accompanied by the growth of general prosperity in which the working classes share. But at a certain stage expansion ceases. The rise of 'coloured' capitalism has limited the demand for the products of Western Europe. Capitalism co-

MARXISM IS DEAD

extensive with the whole world is unthinkable.

But a world socialist economy is still more unthinkable. It is a utopia, like non-violence.

Trotsky is the only great advocate of internationalism and socialist world economy left today—outside India (d). Trotsky is holding aloft the banner of international civil war, of a world communist society—a cause which has been deserted by socialist Russia herself under the leadership of Stalin.

(d) "It is not under the banner of the *status quo* that the European workers and the colonial peoples can rise against imperialism, and against that war which must break out and overthrow the *status quo* almost as inevitably as a developed infant destroys the *status quo* of pregnancy. The toilers have not the slightest interest in defending existing boundaries, especially in Europe—either under the command of their bourgeoisies, or, still less, in a revolutionary insurrection against them. The decline of Europe is caused by the very fact that it is economically split up among almost forty quasi-national States which, with their customs, passports, money systems, and monstrous armies in defence of national particularism, have become a gigantic obstacle on the road of the economic and cultural development of mankind.

"The task of the European proletariat is not the perpetuation of boundaries, but, on the contrary, their revolutionary abolition, not the *status quo*, but a Socialist United States of Europe!" (*The Revolution Betrayed*, pp. 220-21.)

The following question and its answer are reproduced from the report of Trotsky's 'trial' at Mexico (*The Case of Leon Trotsky*, published by Secker and Warburg, 1937, p. 407).

"Dewey (Chairman of the Commission): 'Now I wish to ask you a question more on the line of your theoretical position, about a question involved in the struggle of the Left Opposition. Why did the question of Socialism in one country and the world revolution become such a fundamental point of division?'

"Trotsky: 'Because the theory of socialism in one country signifies in our eyes the repudiation of all internationalism. We consider internationalism not as an abstract idea, but as the first interest of the workers' movement of the world, not for the purpose of building an independent, isolated Socialist State. Then the Russian worker would not have a vital interest in connection with the workers of other countries.'"

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

For the realisation of the international ideal mere faith is not enough. Nor is it enough to say that world economy has been developing under capitalism. World economy has been developing under capitalism for a hundred years, but not in the direction of a world socialist economy. We must not ignore the changes in the world economic situation today as compared with that in the time of Marx and Engels.

The *Communist Manifesto* (1848) says :

“National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto” (p. 26).

Can we say with Marx and Engels that national differences and antagonisms are disappearing? Where is the freedom of commerce? What has become of the world market in wheat and many other commodities? The development of capitalism has produced conditions which are antagonistic to a world socialist economy.

There is need for honest, independent thinking in India. We rely too much on borrowed slogans. Perhaps it will be said that Marx made it unnecessary for any one to think: he revealed the secrets of capitalist production and the law of capitalist development. All that remains now is to establish a world socialist society, which is the inevitable outcome of Marxian dialectic.

This point of view is worse than useless. There is very little difference between an orthodox Marxist and the upholder of revealed religion. The Marxist rejects religion, but he substitutes *Das Kapital* for religious

MARXISM IS DEAD

scriptures and Marx for the religious 'avatar' or prophet. In point of fanaticism there is nothing to choose between our orthodox Marxist and the most fanatical Hindu or Mussalman.

Marx was not omniscient. He made mistakes, both of omission and commission. He exaggerated the influence of the mode of production in shaping the future of human society, and failed to take account of a more powerful factor, the struggle for existence caused by the pressure of population on economic resources. That is how Marxian dialectic 'inevitably' lands us in a utopian muddle.

No socialist world economy can be established without a world State, or, let us say, dictatorship of the world proletariat. Who is working for the world State? Stalin? Hitler? Mussolini? Japan? United States? Britain? Can the world State be established without the co-operation of the leading countries? We are not in the picture at all. It is perfectly ridiculous for us, in a dependent country, to talk of internationalism and a world socialist economy.

A world State must have an international army at its command to maintain law and order throughout the world, to keep capitalist elements under control. This international army would be composed of international soldiers. When ordered by the world General Staff, which would include Chinese, British, Russian and American officers, Japanese soldiers must turn their bayonets against their own countrymen. The art of killing one's own countrymen at the behest of the foreigner is easily acquired by certain countries, not by others.

A real international army can never be created. It will always be controlled by the leading powers. A world

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

State, even if it ever came into existence, would rapidly degenerate into world domination by a few countries. The example of the League of Nations is before us. Britain and France commanded the League. The League of Nations was not directly concerned with the administration of any territories. The world State would have far more power. The struggle among the leading countries to control the world State and to exploit it in their own interests, must break up the world State.

A world system of communism would confer real benefits on humanity, if it were workable. It will convert privately owned means of production into social property, and replace competition by consciously organised and planned production. Social labour will attain its maximum productivity in the new order because of 'the most expedient utilization of the forces of nature and of the natural conditions of production in the various parts of the world', the removal of antagonism between town and country, the closest co-operation between science and technics, and planned organisation of scientific work. "The development of the productive forces of world communist society", it is confidently predicted, "will make it possible to raise the well-being of the whole of humanity." When class antagonisms have ceased to exist, the State will become superfluous and disappear: "At the same time the organs of class domination and the State, in the first place, will disappear also."¹⁰

Let the State disappear. We reconcile ourselves to the loss for the good 'of the whole of humanity.' But

¹⁰ This is from the programme adopted by the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. See *Soviet Rule in Russia*, by Batsell (Macmillan, 1929), pp. 779-81.

MARXISM IS DEAD

a socialist world economy cannot be established without a socialist world revolution. Where is this revolution ?

A programme of 20,000 words was adopted on September 1, 1928, by the sixth World Congress of the Communist International, which met in Moscow. The fifth section of this programme deals with 'the dictatorship of the proletariat in the international social revolution,' and particularly with 'the significance of the U.S.S.R. and her world revolutionary duties.' Being the land 'of a new culture marching under the banner of Marxism,' we are told, 'the U.S.S.R. inevitably becomes the base of the world movement of all oppressed classes, the centre of international revolution, the greatest factor in world history.' The U.S.S.R. is further on described as 'the international driving force of proletarian revolution that impels the proletariat of all countries to seize power.'¹¹

For some time the U.S.S.R. did act as 'the international driving force of proletarian revolution.' Communist propaganda was considerably successful in China, which alarmed Japan, and Japan was also directly affected. (é)

But the world revolutionary activities of the Soviet

¹¹ Batsell, p. 783.

(é) Writing in the *Archiv fuer Rechts und Sozialphilosophie* (Berlin, October 1937), Prof. Kanazawa of the Waseda University, Tokio, says :

"The development of capitalism created a large proletariat, and also much unemployment. This strongly reinforced the social movement, and even a communist organisation was founded under the leadership of the Third International. The organisation was suppressed by the police. Legislation was soon undertaken, particularly in May 2585 (1925 A.D.) in the form of an Act to safeguard the State. This law punished with 10 years' detention or imprisonment the forming of organisations with the object of altering the form of the State or abolishing private property."

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

Union have come to an end.

Stalin believes in building socialism 'in one country.' Russia, while building her own socialism, may still serve as 'the base of the world revolution.' That is what Stalin thought sometime ago.

But when, in March 1936, Mr. Roy Howard asked him in a formal interview whether the Soviet Union had to any degree abandoned 'its plans and intentions for bringing about a world revolution,' Stalin replied, "We never had such plans and intentions" (f).

(f) Here is a fuller extract from the interview given by Stalin to Roy Howard, President of Scripps-Howard newspapers on March 1, 1935 :

"Howard : ' May there not be an element of danger in the genuine fear existent in what you term capitalistic countries of an intent on the part of the Soviet Union to force its political theories on other nations ?'

"Stalin : ' There is no justification whatever for such fears. If you think that Soviet people want to change the face of surrounding States, and by forcible means at that, you are entirely mistaken. Of course, Soviet people would like to see the face of surrounding States changed, but that is the business of the surrounding States. I fail to see what danger the surrounding States can perceive in the ideas of Soviet people if these States are really sitting firmly in the saddle.'

"Howard : ' Does this your statement mean that the Soviet Union has to any degree abandoned its plans and intentions for bringing about a world revolution ?'

"Stalin : ' We never had such plans and intentions.'

"Howard : ' You appreciate, no doubt, Mr. Stalin, that much of the world has long entertained a different impression.'

"Stalin : ' That is the product of a misunderstanding.'

"Howard : ' A tragic misunderstanding ?'

"Stalin : ' No. A comical one. Or perhaps, tragi-comic.'

" ' You see, we Marxists believe that a revolution will also take place in other countries. But it will take place only when the revolutionaries in those countries think it possible, or necessary. The export of revolution is nonsense. Every country will make its own revolution if it wants to, and if it does not want to there will be no revolution. For example, our country wanted to make a revolution and made it, and now we are building a new classless society. But to

MARXISM IS DEAD

There is a profound change in Russian policy in this respect. There is no longer any talk of Russia inciting the oppressed classes in other countries to revolt against the capitalists, much less of 'armed intervention' on the part of Russia against the exploiting classes and their States. Russia is working in the closest unity with the greatest Colonial Powers, Britain and France, in the cause of international peace.

Can we understand the change in her policy? Most easily, if we recognize that Bolsheviki, these Marxian world revolutionaries, have become nationalists like Hitler,

assert that we want to make a revolution in other countries, to interfere in their lives, means saying what is untrue, and what we have never advocated.'" An astounding interview. This is Stalinism, neither Leninism nor Marxism. (See *Soviet Union*, 1936, pp 50-1.)

Referring to this interview Trotsky says in *The Revolution Betrayed* (p. 194): "We in our time aided the workers of Finland, Latvia, Esthonia and Georgia with armed force. We made an attempt to bring aid to the revolting Polish proletariat by the campaign of the Red Army against Warsaw. We sent organizers and commanders to the help of the Chinese in revolution. In 1926 we collected millions of roubles for the aid of the British strikers. At present all this seems to have been a misunderstanding. A tragic one? No, it is comic. No wonder that Stalin has declared that to live in the Soviet Union has become 'gay'. Even the Communist International has changed from a serious to a comic personage.

"Stalin would have made a more convincing impression upon his interviewer if, instead of slandering the past, he had openly contrasted the policy of Thermidor to the policy of October. 'In the eyes of Lenin,' he might have said, 'the League of Nations was a machine for the preparation of a new Imperialist war. We see in it an instrument of peace. Lenin spoke of the inevitability of revolutionary wars. We consider the idea of exporting revolution nonsense. Lenin denounced the union of the proletariat with the imperialist bourgeoisie as treason. We with all our power impel the international proletariat along this road. Lenin slashed the slogan of disarmament under capitalism as a deceit of the workers. We build our whole policy upon this slogan. Your tragi-comic misunderstanding'—Stalin might have concluded—'lies in your taking us for the continuers of Bolshevism, when we are in fact its grave-diggers'."

Mussolini, Gandhi, or humbler fry like you and me.

Mr. Maisky, Soviet Ambassador in England, told the second British National Congress of Peace and Friendship with the U.S.S.R. that the Russian people were 'ready to defend their socialist homeland.'¹² Why not? They should, as patriots. And if their peace is threatened by the rise of Fascist States, they have every right to conclude pacts with other States whose peace is similarly threatened. It is immaterial whether these new-found friends of Russia are the greatest Imperialist Powers. And that is how we find the greatest territorial 'haves,' owning between them about three-fifths of the entire land surface of the globe, banded together for defence against the wicked designs of the 'have-nots.' (g)

12. *For Peace and Friendship* (Gollancz, 1937), p. 26.

(g) The change came with the rise of Hitler to power. Fenner Brockway says (*Workers' Front*, Secker and Warburg, 1938, pp. 59-61): "But once Fascism became a power in Germany, as soon as it became clear that Hitler regarded the communist regime in Russia as his main enemy, the attitude of the Soviet leaders and of the Communist International became one of concentration against Germany at all costs. Everything was sacrificed to the object of defending Russia against the German menace—the very base of the Communist International, its *raison d'être*, the need to organize the working class to carry on the class struggle through its own instruments and in its own strength, the refusal of collaboration with the capitalist class, the Capitalist State, Capitalist Governments and the Capitalist League of Nations—all these were thrown overboard. The Communist International adopted the very policy which it had been formed to reject. It became the defender of collaboration with Capitalist Parties, with Capitalist Governments, and with the Capitalist League. History has not shown a more complete *volte face*."

"To justify this departure in policy a new theory was elaborated, Capitalist States were divided into two categories—the 'war-making dictatorship States' and the 'peace-loving democratic States'... Under the new theory, working class collaboration with the 'peace-loving democratic States' was permissible; the principle of the class-struggle was only to be applied in international policy to the 'war-

MARXISM IS DEAD

The Russian desire for world peace has grown ever stronger with the growing strength of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis. At the moment of writing (Germany having taken Memel Land) great emphasis is laid on combined action by Russia, Britain and France to resist German aggression. These three Powers are to form a 'solid block of peace' in Europe. The talk is of peace. The world revolution and the world socialist economy have vanished into thin air.

But, the reader will say, what else can Russia do? Isolation would mean death. If at this time Russia stirred up revolt in the colonies and dependencies of Britain and France, she would be jeopardizing her own safety. How could Britain and France go to her assistance when she was attacked by Germany on one side and Japan on the other? The only socialist country in the world is threatened with extinction. Therefore the 'correct' tactics are expressed by the slogan: 'Co-operation with Imperialism to safe-guard Socialism!'

making dictatorship States.' The class-struggle was redefined in international affairs. It was no longer to be conducted against capitalism, but only against capitalism when it had developed to the stage of Fascism."

Continuing the same theme Brockway says (pp. 64-5):

"By the manner in which she entered the League Soviet Russia definitely put aside the class-struggle theory of the political structure of capitalism. She identified herself wholeheartedly with the League.

"This became evident from Litvinoff's first speech, which, indeed, only reflected what had previously been written in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, the organs of the Soviet Government. After dividing the world into war-threatening and peace-loving nations, Litvinoff proceeded to pay a eulogistic tribute to the 'sincere international idealism' of the statesmen of the latter, bowing especially to the representatives of France and Britain as he did so. The representative of France was M. Laval. The representative of Britain was Sir John Simon. Sincere international idealism!"

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

The meaning of recent events is clear as daylight—except to those who have become deliberately blind. The class-struggle has ended. The national struggle for existence has driven the class-struggle into the background (*h*).

Russia would like to see class-war raging fiercely, not in Britain and France, but in Germany, Italy and Japan. If civil war broke out in Fascist countries, the Fascist danger would pass away, like an ugly dream. The 'peace-loving Powers' would intervene, remove the Dictators, enforce disarmament, and make the world 'safe for democracy' once more.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF CAPITAL

Suppose the combined strength of the peace-loving

(*h*) Borkenau thus describes the change in the character of the Communist International and Russian foreign policy after Hitler's rise to power (*The Communist International*. Faber and Faber.)

"As soon as Hitler became a real menace to Russia the latter realised its position and its reactions became entirely different from those of the time when the war-scare had been a mere pretence. Now the factional dissensions receded into the background. It is not that a more tolerant regime was adopted. On the contrary, the fight against Trotskyism or what was described as Trotskyism by the Comintern machinery, soon became more furious than ever. But it was itself an element of Russian international policy, one of the many arguments by which Russia attempted to convince the Western Powers that it had definitely dropped all revolutionary intentions and was worthy of an alliance. To the attempt to create an international alliance against German and Japanese Fascism everything was subordinated.

"Let us sum up this decisive development once more in a few words: at first the Comintern had aimed at being an instrument of international revolution. With revolution receding into the dim future, first in the West and then in the East, it had increasingly become a card to be played in Russian factional fights, an instrument without any importance of its own. Now for the first time it became essentially an instrument of Russian foreign policy; and the first aim of this policy was: break Russia's isolation; the principle means: inspire confidence, wipe out Russia's past. The main conclusions from this premiss were obvious" (p. 388).

MARXISM IS DEAD

Powers overcomes the Fascist danger. Suppose Hitler and Mussolini are defeated in war and disappear. Or suppose there is no war, but a merciful Providence, listening to the prayers of oppressed humanity, removes the two dictators. Will a change to democracy in Italy and Germany end the national struggle for existence and prepare the way for a world socialist economy?

Never. National antagonisms will never cease. It will never be possible to bring all nations under a single political or economic system.

A world system of communism presupposes the internationalization of world capital. As soon as a world State has come into being, it will assume control and direction of the natural and other resources of all countries. India, for example, will be required to hand over to an International Planning Commission all her factories, tools, implements, mines, quarries, land and forests. If we resisted, an international army would coerce us.

We shall not resist, at any rate not violently. We might 'fast unto death' to melt the hearts of our international oppressors, if they possessed hearts capable of melting.

On p. 393 Borkenau says: "This campaign against Trotskyism won importance in connection with a broader change of Comintern views. Stalin was aiming at replacing the out-of-date ideology of social revolution and the class struggle by something more stable and was naturally driven to rely upon Russian nationalism and the worship of his own person as the *voshd*, the 'wise leader of the peoples,' the Fuehrer in one word, the superman, the saviour. History was re-written for this double purpose."

History has indeed been re-written. See for example. *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Moscow, 1939). Stalin is the hero throughout; Trotsky, Bukharin and other executed leaders appear as enemies and traitors from the very first.

A 'SCIENTIFIC' UTOPIA

One supposes that when a world socialist economy comes, coloured races, *e.g.*, Indians and Japanese, would be permitted to settle in Australia, Canada and the rest of America. At present strict immigration laws prevent large-scale international movements of labour. A world socialist economy would mean very little if it did not relieve the pressure of population in densely-inhabited parts of the world through colonization of thinly-peopled countries irrespective of colour prejudices. Is such a thing conceivable? White labour so far has never expressed its international solidarity with coloured labour in the matter of colonization. It never will (i).

The British standard of living is high because of the Empire that Britain owns. In a socialist world system there must occur a relative and an absolute fall in the British standard of living. I am not sure whether India would be better off as a member of a world socialist economy than as an independent country with a socialist economy of her own. India is a rich country. Under our own economy our resources would be utilized

(i). The 'clash' between Britain and Japan on the question of population is discussed by Lt. Commander Tota Ishimaru of the Imperial Japanese Navy, in his well-known work, *Japan Must Fight Britain*. The author quotes with approval lengthy passages from Prof. Thompson's *Danger Spots in World Population*. Prof. Thompson recognizes that Japan 'needs more territory for agricultural expansion' and 'larger natural resources for the development of its industry.' What is the direction which the Japanese movement of expansion will take? Manchuko, says the Lt. Commander, 'may serve to relieve Japan's excess of population and shortage or lack of natural resources for some ten or twenty years, but not for much longer' (p 88.) She may turn her attention next to Australia and New Zealand. There are unused lands in Australia. To Prof. Thompson it seems 'the part of commonsense for Australia to help Japan secure these lands' (p. 90.)

MARXISM IS DEAD

exclusively for our own good. Under a world economy we shall share these resources with the rest of the world. We shall have a share in the wealth that the whole world will produce, but that is of little consequence. India can be made self-sufficient in a very high degree—she has no need of the rest of the world.

If I were asked to choose between a world economy and British Imperialism, I would, without a moment's hesitation, choose the latter. Exploitation by a single Imperialist country is a lesser evil than exploitation by the whole world.

The British reaction to this demand may be best studied in the proceedings of the Empire and Migration Development Conference recently held in London. Britain is awakening to the dangers threatening the British Empire in leaving vast areas of the Dominions unpopulated. It has been suggested that British manufacturers should transfer parts of their establishments to the Dominions and take their personnel with them. Viscount Bledisloe, a former Governor-General of New Zealand, said :

"The over-crowded ambitious countries of the world, conscious of their virility, their stifled enterprise, and their need of expansion, inevitably represent our British race as owning all the earth of most habitable empty spaces and not using them.

"They not unnaturally stigmatise us as 'dogs in the manger'—an expression which does not conduce to world peace. Either we must 'go and possess the land' which our forefathers acquired for the British Crown, or, sooner or later, combined pressure from foreign nations will operate effectively and impair the territorial integrity of the British Empire." (*Statesman*, Calcutta, dated 24th October 1937, p. 12)

CHAPTER V

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE DIGGER OF MARXISM

It must be admitted that Marxism, interpreted as internationalism, is dead.

What is left of Marxism interpreted as 'socialism in one country'?

A Marxist society is a class-less society. Russia claims to be such a society.

Means of production have been nationalized in Russia. And yet doubts remain whether the nationalization of means of production has created a real class-less society and put an end to the class-struggle in Russia.

Below, in parallel columns, are quoted statements which contradict each other. In the first column speak Stalin and other builders of the class-less socialist society in Russia. The statement in the second column emanates from no bourgeois critic of the Soviet Union, but 'le Camarade' Yvon, a French communist. Comrade Yvon went to the Soviet Union to assist in the work of 'socialist-construction.' He worked in the Soviet Union in various capacities and rose to be a factory director. Altogether he spent eleven years in the country.

SOVIET SOCIETY

STALIN

"We have no contending parties any more than we have a capitalist class contending against a working class which is exploited by the capitalists. Our society consists exclusively of free toilers of town and country—workers, peasants, intellectuals. Each of these strata may have its special interests and

COMRADE YVON

"There are classes in U.S.S.R.: privileged classes and exploited classes,—classes which dominate and classes which are dominated.

"Their standards of living are clearly distinguished.

"Classes on the railways exactly correspond to the social classes; the same is true of those on ships,

MARXISM IS DEAD

STALIN

express them by means of the numerous public organizations that exist. But since there are no classes, since the dividing lines between classes have been obliterated, since only a slight, but not a fundamental, difference between various strata in socialist society has remained, there can be no soil for the creation of contending parties. Where there are not several classes there cannot be several parties, for a party is part of a class.

"Under 'National-Socialism' there is also only one party. But nothing will come of this Fascist one-party system. The point is that in Germany, capitalism and classes have remained, the class struggle has remained and will force itself to the surface in spite of everything, even in the struggle between parties which represent antagonistic classes, just as it did in Spain, for example."¹

COMRADE YVON

in restaurants, theatres, shops²; or some rise palaces on the most pleasant sites, for the others there are wooden barracks near tool-sheds, and oily machines. Continually the same people occupy the palaces; continually the same people live in the barracks.

"There is no longer any private property; there is only one form of property, State property. But the State does not represent all citizens, any more than in the preceding regimes.

"This State property is enjoyed by a few; the great majority maintain it, embellish it, respect it, fear it and are separated from it by a police and a gigantic repressive machinery, more gigantic than that which, not long ago, separated the people from private property. . . .

"Capitalistic concentration certainly leads to the seizure of productive forces by a new class, but

¹ Howard had asked this question: "A new constitution is being elaborated in the U.S.S.R. providing for a new system of elections. To what degree can this new system alter the situation in the U.S.S.R., since, as formerly, only one party will come forward at elections?" (*Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 56). The answer of Stalin was that since Russia was a class-less society, there could be only one party in the Soviet Union. We are here not interested in the one-party system, but in the class-less structure of the Soviet Union.

² In *Russia Without Illusions*, Pat Sloan says (pp. 62-63):

"Certain readers may be surprised at my reference to first, second, and third class on the steamers. When I add that in the train services of the U.S.S.R. the same terms are also sometimes used certain of you may exclaim, 'Oh, but I thought classes had been abolished in the U.S.S.R.' Let me, therefore, at this point explain that when it is said that classes have been abolished in the U.S.S.R., this means that the division of society into landlords, employers and working people has been abolished. . . .

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

STALIN

On November 17, 1935, Stalin declared that there was no exploitation in the Soviet Union: "People in our country do not work for exploiters, but for themselves." *Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 12).

Mezhlauk (Chairman of the State Planning Commission): "The approach of the Soviet Union to the full realisation of a class-less socialist society is becoming increasingly manifest in the political, economic and social life in our country." (*Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 325).

Molotov (Chairman of the Council of the People's Commissars): "Socialist economy has been established in all our branches of production and thus the basis of the classes has been definitely undermined and the conditions for a class-less socialist society, created." (*Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 139.)

COMRADE YVON

nothing permits us to affirm that this class will necessarily be that of producers. Barring the path of the proletariat, there is found standing in the path to power the class of high functionaries.

"Workers have not necessarily a world to gain and their chains to lose. They may unconsciously forge for themselves heavier [chains.] (*Il en est de plus lourdes, qu'ils peuvent inconsciemment se forger*) . . .

"In 1917 the Russian people had truly carried their revolution to the end; the history that remains to write is of the manner in which they have allowed themselves to be cheated.

"In any case, the struggle continues. The constitution of the new classes produces new class struggles. There cannot exist any more in the U.S.S.R., than any where else, 'general interest' or community of interest between higher and lower classes."

(*Ce qu' est devenue la Revolution Russe. Les Brochures de La Revolution Proletarienne*, pp. 86-87).

"It may be remarked here that in the U.S.S.R. the provision of different classes of steamer travel is on a par with the selling of goods of different qualities in the shops. Contrary to much that has been said and written about socialism, the U.S.S.R. does not aim at standardizing tastes or incomes; it is aiming at the greatest possible variety of human consumption and at satisfying the most varied tastes. . . .

"According to their earnings and tastes people may have a 2-rouble seat at a theatre or a 10-rouble seat; a 100-rouble coat or a 500-rouble coat; a 'hard' seat in a train where they can sleep without a mattress; or, in the first class, a soft, well-sprung bed. Such distinctions of quality will exist for a very long time, and possibly always, even in Communist society, for there is no reason whatever to suppose that everyone will always want the same quality of everything,

MARXISM IS DEAD

It is impossible to reconcile the declarations made by the Soviet leaders quoted above with Comrade Yvon's statement. One would be inclined to dismiss Comrade Yvon as a fascist in the guise of a communist, or as an agent of the bourgeoisie, or a lackey of capital, or a liar, but for the fact that his contention that classes and the class-struggle exist in the Soviet Union, despite State ownership of the means of production, is well-founded.

If we take the view that economic classes cease to exist as soon as private ownership in the means of production is abolished, then Russia, in this technical sense, is a country without classes. If the only evidence of exploitation of man by man under capitalism is the fact that a property-less worker sells his labour-power to a property-owning capitalist, then there is no exploitation of man by man in the Soviet Union, since there are no private capitalists there. But let us not quarrel about words. Exploitation is not a matter of words, phrases, or definitions. It is not something abstract or unsubstantial. In Marxism exploitation has a tangible, solid form. It consists in the appropriation by the bourgeoisie of the surplus value created by labour. Exploitation finds its tangible expression in the fact that the worker gets little more than bare subsistence; he is badly housed, insufficiently clothed and underfed, while the bourgeois rolls in wealth. As capitalist accumulation proceeds, the bour-

for, as we know, people differ in their opinions very much as to what kind of thing is most comfortable, and many prefer simplicity to luxury even though they can afford the latter."

But there is a considerable difference between preferring discomfort to comfort, and living in discomfort because you must. Poverty is not a matter of taste.

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE DIGGER OF MARXISM

geoisie grows richer and the proletariat poorer, not only in a relative but an absolute sense. The real meaning of exploitation is found in the contrast between the economic conditions of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie under capitalism.

Suppose the roles of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in distribution were reversed. Would it be possible then to talk of exploitation of the property-less by the property-owning classes? I should think not. The real objection to the private ownership of land and capital is that it enriches the 'haves' and impoverishes the 'have-nots.'

It must never be forgotten that Marxism or class-war was born in times when the condition of the industrial worker in the foremost industrial country, England, was one of grinding, intolerable, inhuman poverty.

Marx sometimes uses very strong language. In *Das Kapital* he says: "If money, as Augier says, 'comes into the world bearing natural marks of blood on either cheek', capital comes oozing dirt and blood from head to foot; from all pores" (*Wenn das Geld, nach Augier 'mit natuerlichen Blutflecken auf einer Backe zur Welt kommt,' so das Kapital von Kopf bis Zeh, aus allen Poren, Blut-und Schmutz-triefend.*)³ In an earlier chapter, where Marx describes the economic condition of the poorly paid classes of British industrial workers, he speaks of 'the intimate connection between the pangs of hunger of the most industrious clas-

³ *Das Kapital*, Vol. I, Kautsky's ed., p. 688. Kerr ed. (pp. 833-34):—"If money, according to Augier, 'comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek,' capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt," The difference is unimportant, but I prefer my own translation.

MARXISM IS DEAD

ses of workers and wasteful consumption (*Verschwendungskonsum*), whether in coarse or refined forms, of the rich, founded on capitalist accumulation.”⁴

Engels is no less sensible than Marx of the antagonism between the rich and the poor. If the labourer, he says, ‘is so happy as to find work, *i.e.*, if the bourgeoisie does him the favour to enrich itself by means of him, wages await him which scarcely suffice to keep body and soul together; if he can get no work, he may steal, if he is not afraid of the police, or starve. . . .’⁵ During his residence in England, at least 20 or 30 persons, according to Engels, died of simple starvation under the most revolting circumstances. The housing conditions were indescribably wretched; in regard to dress, the working class was ‘scarcely ever in a position to use a thread of woollen clothing’⁶; as for food, the worker got ‘what was too bad for the property-holding class’: “The potatoes which the workers buy are usually poor, the vegetables wilted, the cheese old and of poor quality, the bacon rancid, the meat lean, tough, taken from old, often diseased cattle, or such as have died a natural death, and not fresh even then, often half decayed.”⁷ Adulteration was commonly practised, but the worst sufferers were the workers: “The rich are less deceived because they can pay the high prices of the large shops which have a reputation to lose”⁸

4 *Das Kapital*, Vol. I, p. 594, Kerr ed., Vol. I, pp. 721-22.

5 *Condition of the Working Classes in England*. (London, George Allen), p. 25.

6 *Ibid.* p. 67.

7 *Ibid.* p. 68.

8 *Ibid.* p. 70.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

That is not how the British worker lives today, but the point of my argument is that even when land and capital are nationalized, exploitation is not ended if the distribution of wealth is such that the majority of the workers enjoy very little more than the bare necessities of existence* while a minority, composed of well-paid workers and bureaucrats, get the best of everything; exploitation is not ended when unearned income in the shape of interest accrues to those who can save on account of their disproportionately high salaries; exploitation is not ended if inheritance remains, for inheritance is unearned income *par excellence*.

Fenner Brockway says :—

“Even in Soviet Russia, where workers’ power was gloriously won in 1917, the increased differentiation of income and the reintroduction of the right of inheritance indicate a retreat from the class-less society of socialism rather than advance towards it.”⁹

Did Marx give inheritance a place in his ideal

* Leon Trotsky says in *Revolution Betrayed*, pp. 123-24 :—

“As concerns the fundamental masses, they, of course, have neither cows nor gardens, nor even in large part their own homes. The wages of unskilled workers are 1200 to 1500 roubles a year, and even less—which, under Soviet prices, means a regime of destitution. Living conditions, the most reliable indicator of the material and cultural level, are extremely bad, often unbearable. The overwhelming majority of the workers huddle in common dwellings, which in equipment and upkeep are considerably worse than barracks. When it is necessary to justify industrial unsuccesses, malingerings, and trashy products, the administration, itself through its journalists, gives such a picture as this of living conditions : ‘The workers sleep on the floor, since bedbugs eat them up in the beds. The chairs are broken; there are no mugs to drink water from, etc.’ ‘Two families live in one room. The roof leaks. When it rains they carry the water out of the room by pails.’ ‘The privies are in a disgusting condition.’ Such descriptions, relating to different parts of the country, could be multiplied at will.”⁹ *Workers’ Front*. p. 25.

MARXISM IS DEAD

society whether in the lower or the higher phase ?¹⁰.

The facts quoted by Comrade Yvon regarding the differentiation of income are the following ¹¹:—

	HIGHEST AND LOWEST MONTHLY SALARIES.	USUAL MONTHLY SALARIES.
Workers	... from 80 to 400 R.	125 to 250 R.
Small employees	... from 80 to 300 R.	130 to 225 R
Maid servants	... from 50 to 60 R. plus board and lodging.	
Employees and average technicians	... from 300 to 800 R.	
Responsible administra- tors and specialists. high officials, some professors, artists and writers.	.. from 1,500 to 10,000 R. and more; for some the monthly income is quoted at 20,000 to 30,000 R.	

10 The third demand in the *Communist Manifesto* was 'Abolition of all right of inheritance,' p. 28. An attempt to explain this away is made by Ryazanoff (pp. 186-87—*The Communist Manifesto*) :—

"During the epoch of the First International, Bakunin was the principal advocate of schemes to abolish the right of inheritance. For him this was a basic demand. The General Council, for which Marx acted as spokesman, declared that the right of inheritance was not a productive category, that the laws of inheritance did not constitute a cause but were an effect, a legal reflexion, of the prevailing economic organization of society, that by converting the means of production into socially owned property we should once for all render laws relating to inheritance superfluous. The aim should be, then, to abolish those institutions which endowed certain individuals with power to exploit others. The abolition or the curtailment of the rights of inheritance might act as the starting-point for social reform. Such an invasion of the domain of property rights and inheritance rights would be expedient during the transition period, on the one hand, when the old economic foundations had not been completely swept away, and on the other hand, when the working class was already in such a position as to be able to introduce radical changes in legal relations. Among the measures for the transition period we may, therefore, include the raising of the tax on inherited property and a curtailment of the right of bequest."

It follows that when the old economic foundations have been swept away, the right of inheritance may be reintroduced as a means of producing a class-less society ! Inheritance, one supposes, would facilitate the transition from socialism to communism !

11 Yvon, loc. cit., pp. 25-26.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARNISM

PENSIONS

Workers' pension ... from 25 to 80 R. per month without any privileges.

Pensions granted to widows of high officials and important specialists range from 250 to 1,000 roubles per month *plus* villas or apartments for life and scholarships for their children and sometimes even for their grandchildren.

Commenting on these figures, Comrade Yvon says :—

“It is evident from these tables that on the one hand there are considerable differences within the same category (for example, from 80 to 400 R.), and on the other, between the categories (*pourquoi ne pas dire classes?*—why not say classes?) the difference extends from 25 R. for the pensioned worker to 10,000 R. and more for the privileged worker in active service.” *

He calls a pension of 30 to 50 R. ‘*une veritable pension de misere*’ (a true pension of poverty or a miserable pittance). As we shall see presently, the purchasing power of a pension of this amount is not very great, equal

* Leon Trotsky says in the *Revolution Betrayed*, pp. 230-31 :—

“The real divisions of Soviet Society which should and might easily be revealed with the help of an honest census, are as follows : heads of the bureaucracy, specialists, etc., living in bourgeois conditions ; medium and lower strata, on the level of the petty bourgeoisie ; worker and collective farm aristocracy—approximately on the same level ; medium working mass ; medium stratum of collective farmers ; individual peasants and craftsmen ; lower worker and peasant strata passing over into *lumpenproletariat* ; homeless children, prostitutes, etc.

“When the new constitution announces that in the Soviet Union ‘abolition of the exploitation of man by man’ has been attained, it is not telling the truth. The new social differentiation has created conditions for the revival of the exploitation of man in its most barbarous form—that of buying him into slavery for personal service.”

to 4—6 rupees.¹²

Finally Comrade Yvon exclaims : “ How far are we from the famous thesis in which Lenin proclaimed in 1917 : ‘ The salaries of the highest officials should not exceed the average salary of a good worker ’ (*Pravda* of 20th April, 1917) ! ” ¹³

Speaking on the Party Programme in March, 1919, Lenin deprecated a policy of pin-pricks with regard to experts. He would pay them more than the worker, but five times more, not a hundred times more (100 : 10,000). Even paying experts five times more than the worker, Lenin thought, was overpaying experts. Marx, as we have seen, would pay everybody ‘ ordinary working men’s wages ’ nothing more.¹⁴

12 De Basily says in *Russia under Soviet Rule* (George Allen, 1932), p. 380 :—

“ The pensions paid to workers in the U.S.S.R., in the case of their having lost their capacity to work, have little attraction. Such pensions usually amount to from 25 to 50 roubles per month. It rarely reaches 70 or 80 roubles. With wages of 150—200 roubles a month the worker is condemned to an existence which borders on misery. It is easily understood that he contemplates with real terror the date when he will be obliged to retire on his scanty pension. Even at the age of seventy, many Russian workmen strive to be allowed to continue working in the factories. But if the Soviet Government unblushingly pays a pittance of 35 roubles a month to workmen who have spent fifty years of their lives in front of their machines, it readily grants to its dignitaries, prominent party members, directors of large enterprises, responsible specialists, etc., monthly pensions of from 300 to 1,500 roubles, with the additional advantage of the lifelong use of a roomy and comfortable flat.”

13 Yvon, p. 13.

14 Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 351 :— “ We must not practise a policy of petty pinpricks with regard to the experts. These experts are not the servitors of the exploiters; they are active cultural workers, who in bourgeois society served the bourgeoisie, and of whom all socialists all over the world said that in a proletarian society they would serve us. In the transition period we must

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

The existing differentiation of income in Russia may be described as Stalinism. It is neither Leninism nor Marxism. Marxism is definitely dead.

How do workers live in Russia ? By workers we do not mean privileged officials or high bureaucrats, nor even the labour aristocracy of Russia, the Stakhanovists. No revolution is of any significance unless it ameliorates the condition of the most numerous class. What is the purchasing power of the average factory worker in Russia and how does it compare with that of the average worker in a capitalist country like England ?

Money wages have undoubtedly been rising in Russia. According to Sir Walter Citrine, the average earnings for adult workers were 189 roubles per month in 1935 ; for 1937 he has calculated the following average monthly earnings on the basis of statistics published by the Russian Trade Delegation in Great Britain, in its report for December, 1937 :

endow them with the best possible conditions of life. That will be the best policy. That will be the most economical management. Otherwise, while economising a few hundred millions, we may lose so much that no number of billions will restore what we have lost.

"When we discussed the question of rates of pay with the Commissar of Labour, Comrade Schmidt, he mentioned facts like these. He said that in the matter of equalizing wages we have done more than has been done anywhere, and more than any bourgeois State can do in scores of years. Take the pre-war rates of pay : a manual labourer used to get one rouble a day, twenty-five roubles a month, while an expert got five hundred roubles a month, not counting those who were paid hundreds of thousands of roubles. The expert used to receive twenty times more than the worker. Our present rates of pay vary from six hundred roubles to three thousand roubles—five times more. We have done a great deal in the matter of equalization. Of course, we are now overpaying experts, but to pay them a little more for science is not only worth while, but necessary and theoretically essential."

MARXISM IS DEAD

Transport	283·5 R.
Heavy Industry	280·5 R.
Light Industry	196·3 R.
Food Industry	201·0 R.
Timber Industry	198·0 R.

The simple arithmetic average of these figures is 232 roubles, but allowing for the greater number of people employed in the heavy industries, Sir Walter Citrine takes about 250 roubles as the average monthly earnings for 1937.

It should be noted that these figures include the salaries of directors, technicians and the managerial staffs. The average earnings of manual workers must therefore be less than 250 roubles. Sir Walter Citrine complains that 'no statistics are available which indicate precisely what are the average earnings for manual workers.'¹⁵

Nor are official statistics available showing variations in the purchasing power of the rouble. The purchasing power of money depends on the level of prices. When money wages rise, prices remaining unchanged, the purchasing power of the worker increases. But when prices are rising rapidly, even a considerable increase in money wages may mean no gain in purchasing power. Real wages fall when prices rise more rapidly than money wages.

Most countries of Europe possess cost of living index numbers, which are regularly published. In India, eleven series of cost of living index numbers are at present being published every month.

¹⁵ *I Search for the Truth in Russia*, by Sir Walter Citrine (Popular ed. 1938), p. 388.

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

Cost of living index numbers are of the greatest value in studying the rise or fall in working-class standards of living. It is most remarkable that the Soviet Union does not publish any cost of living index numbers.

According to Hubbard, up to the year 1930, the State Planning Commission (Gosplan), issued a monthly review containing useful information. But in 1950 it was decreed that statistics had to 'play a practical part in the war of communism against capitalism.'¹⁶ The result is that 'no statistics of any sort are issued dealing with prices, currency, housing, cost of living, and a number of other economic phenomena which are indispensable to a true evaluation of any economic system.'

Here we are not so much concerned with the rise or fall in real wages in the Soviet Union since 1928, as with the purchasing power of the average wage in 1937.

Let us take 250 R. as the average wage of a factory worker, and add one-third for the socialized wage. This makes the average earnings of the Russian worker 333 roubles per month, or 1.90 roubles per hour.

As compared with this the average earnings of British workers are estimated at 1s. 1½d. per hour.¹⁷

Sir Walter Citrine points out that in making this comparison he is not 'loading the dice against the Russian worker.' First, the figure for the Russian worker has been taken from an average which includes the earnings of directors, managers and technicians; second, no allowance has been made for deductions from the Russian worker's wages, which are appreciable; third, the Russian worker's average has been increased by one-third on

¹⁶ *Soviet Trade and Distribution* (Macmillan, 1938), p. 368

¹⁷ Sir Walter Citrine, loc. cit., p. 389.

MARXISM IS DEAD

account of the socialized wage, while no similar addition has been made to the figure for the British worker ; fourth, the British average earnings for workers include men, women, boys and girls.

What is the relation of 1·90 R. to 1s. 1½d.?

Officially the rouble is quoted at 26 to the £. At this rate 1·90 R. is equal to about 1s. 6d. or the money wages, per hour, of the Russian worker, are higher than those of the British worker.

But money wages mean very little. What is the purchasing power of 1·90 R. in Russia as compared with the purchasing power of 1s. 1½d. in England? On the basis of detailed price comparisons Sir Walter Citrine reaches the conclusion that "the Russian worker has to work at least four times as long as the British worker to purchase the same commodities." ¹⁸ In other words, the purchasing power of the average factory worker in socialist Russia, where means of production are owned by the State and there are no private capitalists fattening on surplus value, is about one-fourth of that in capitalist England where the worker is mercilessly exploited by the bourgeoisie. Not a comparison extremely flattering to socialist organization of industry ! ¹⁹

¹⁸ *I Search for the Truth in Russia*, p. 391.

¹⁹ Earnest Mercier, a French industrialist who visited Russia in January 1936, estimated the value of the rouble in terms of purchasing power at 75 centimes (2½d. at that time ; before the conclusion of the Tripartite Currency Agreement between France, England and the United States, £1 was equal to 75 or 76 francs). Making all sorts of allowances in favour of the Soviet worker Mercier concluded that the Soviet worker was 'practically reduced to an extremely hard, if not a miserable, life, which would become even to him, in spite of his atavistic indifference, rapidly intolerable, if it were not general, or if it did not appear to him to be such.' (*U.S.S.R. Reflexions*, pp. 41-2, Editions du Centre Polytechnicien d'études économiques).

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

At the official rate of 26 to the £, a rouble is about equal to 8 annas. But in terms of purchasing power the rouble is worth much less.

REAL WAGES IN U.S.S.R. AND INDIA

The following table shows prices in Russia and in England in December, 1937, and prices in Lahore at the end of 1938. Prices in Russia and in England have been taken from Sir Walter Citrine's work, *I Search for the Truth in Russia* (pp. 292-93). Alongside the Lahore price I have given an index figure showing how much more of the commodity would be purchased by a rupee as compared with a rouble. For example, the figure (39) against 9 pies means that the purchasing power of the rupee in terms of wheat flour, as compared with the rouble, is 39 times greater.

Purchasing Power of the Rouble and the Rupee.

Commodity.	Price in Russia. Roubles.	Price in England.	Lahore
Wheat flour per lb.	1 82 to 2 54	2½d.	0 0 9 (39)
Meat "	3.18 to 5.45	4½d. to 1s. 4½d.	0 4 0 (12)
Sugar "	1.73 to 1 82	2½d. to 3d.	0 2 0 (14)
Butter "	6 81 to 9.09	1s. 4½d. to 1s. 5½d.	1 0 0 (6)
Potato per 7 lbs.	1.91	6½d.	0 7 0 (4)
Eggs per dozen	6.60 to 9.00	2s. 6d.	0 8 0 (13)
Onions per lb	0 50	2d	0 0 9 (11)
Cabbage "	0 27	1½d.	0 1 0 (4)
Carrots "	0.27	2d.	0 0 6 (8)
Tomatoes "	2.27	4d. and 6d.	0 4 0 (9)
Dress.			
Men's winter coats	500 to 1,500	£1 10s. to £3 10s.	Rs. 47 (10)
" water-proofs	200 to 300	14s. 6d. to £1 1s.	Rs. 14 (14)
" suits	700 to 1,200	£1 10s. to £3 15s.	Rs. 50 (14)
" hats	25 to 40	5s. 6d. to 7s. 6d.	Rs. 5 (5)
" boots and shoes	150 to 300	8s. 11d. to 18s. 11d.	Rs. 13 (11)
" shirts	32 to 46	3s. 11d. to 8s. 11d.	Rs. 6 (5)

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARNISM

In terms of the articles of food (first ten articles) the purchasing power of the rupee on an average is 12 times greater than that of the rouble. In each case I have compared the Lahore price with the lower Russian price. The index is low in the case of potatoes (4), cabbage (4) and butter (6). If we took *ghi* instead of butter, the index would rise from 6 to 10. The index is highest in the case of wheat flour, and this is important.

In regard to articles of dress I have compared the higher English price, converted into rupees, with the lower Russian price. Actual Indian prices are, in some cases, lower. A good pair of shoes in Lahore costs less than Rs. 13 and a cotton shirt less than Rs. 6.

In terms of these articles of dress the purchasing power of the rupee is equal to that of about 10 roubles.

The comparison, of course, is not exact, but if the figures of prices in Russia, quoted by Sir Walter Citrine, are reliable (which we have not the slightest reason to doubt), the purchasing power of the rupee is at least 8 times greater than that of the rouble, or a rupee is equal to 8 roubles.

Sir Walter puts the value of the rouble in terms of purchasing power at 3*d*.²⁰ or Re. 0-2-8. But it is well known that in terms of commodities and services Rs. 13-5-4 are worth more in India than £1 in England.

20 See Sir Walter Citrine, loc. cit., pp. 140-42. Commenting on the prices of articles of common use in Russia and their relation to estimated prices of similar articles in England, Sir Walter Citrine says: "It will be noticed that these prices varied very much from article to article, and it would be a generous estimate to say that the rouble is worth about 3*d*. It is certainly worth less than this, as the illegal exchange rate goes to prove."

MARXISM IS DEAD

An average wage of 250 R. in Russia is thus equal to not 125 rupees, but $31\frac{1}{4}$ rupees.

The following statement shows the average monthly earnings in certain graded occupations in the engineering industry in the Bombay Presidency .²¹

[TABLE]

²¹ *Report on Wages in the Engineering Industry in the Bombay Presidency* (Bombay Labour Office, 1935), p. 88

Average monthly earnings for all workers in six of the important graded occupations—all Factories

Area.	Moulders		Black-smiths.		Fitters.		Machinists (Turners)		Carpenter.		Painters	
	Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.	Rs.	a. p.
1. Bombay City	42	4 9 (592)	50	11 0 (534)	55	13 7 (3,985)	54	3 5 (1,614)	51	4 11 (2,544)	40	13 8 (1,177)
2. Bombay Suburban, Thana. Kolaba and Ratnagiri ...	27	1 5 (11)	52	13 4 (34)	51	11 9 (404)	49	3 0 (89)	39	14 10 (135)	31	7 11 (29)
3. Ahmedabad City	36	1 2 (154)	51	0 10 (113)	49	8 6 (773)	44	10 1 (315)	54	4 10 (415)	38	15 9 (24)
4. Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panchmahals	70	12 10 (94)	70	8 5 (64)	71	11 9 (411)	56	4 10 (249)	51	1 9 (35)	37	8 9 (23)
5. Broach and Surat	40	8 0 (4)	46	3 3 (8)	63	2 8 (66)	54	5 5 (18)	41	10 5 (18)	Nil	
6. East and West Khandesh...	36	0 7 (14)	38	13 5 (21)	40	4 8 (284)	34	14 0 (66)	36	6 8 (42)	34	1 9 (7)
7. Poona, Nasik and Ahmed- nagar	31	4 9 (70)	38	4 6 (64)	43	7 5 (473)	42	6 7 (183)	34	14 11 (154)	31	7 5 (53)
8. Sholapur City	25	9 2 (14)	33	10 2 (22)	36	5 4 (143)	32	15 8 (31)	29	0 11 (63)	34	15 1 (10)
9. Sholapur and Satara	20	3 9 (49)	29	1 8 (17)	40	15 4 (58)	33	13 0 (33)	33	1 3 (23)	33	8 1 (9)
10. Belgaum, Dharwar & Bijapur	41	1 4 (57)	32	2 2 (93)	46	1 8 (466)	45	4 8 (174)	47	3 7 (228)	43	7 0 (88)
Presidency Proper	41	10 3 (1,059)	50	6 0 (970)	53	4 9 (7,063)	51	1 4 (2,772)	49	9 0 (3,657)	40	3 2 (1,420)

MARXISM IS DEAD

With wages varying between Rs. 40 and Rs. 53, it will appear that these classes of workers in the Bombay Presidency possess greater purchasing power than the average industrial worker in the U.S.S.R., with purchasing power equal to Rs. 31-4-0.

The following table shows frequencies of rates for workers on daily rates in the engineering industry of the Bombay Presidency :

[TABLE]

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

Frequencies of rates for workers on daily rates.

Daily rates of wages	Moulders.		Blacksmiths		Fitters.		Machinists		Carpenters.	
	Total	0 0	Total	0 0	Total	0 0	Total	0 0	Total	0 0
Below As 8	12	1.71	..	7.64	7	0.22	5	0.35	13	0.59
As 8 and below	76	10.81	39	5.55	177	5.55	81	5.84	142	6.45
Re. 1	164	23.32	92	18.03	470	14.76	233	16.22	249	12.21
Re. 1-8	209	29.72	102	20.01	611	19.17	297	19.97	471	21.38
Rs. 2-0	109	15.51	99	19.41	620	19.46	301	20.95	583	26.47
Rs. 2-8	49	6.97	92	18.04	527	16.54	312	21.71	471	21.38
Rs. 3-0	77	10.96	35	6.86	594	18.65	159	11.07	238	10.81
Rs. 3-8	1	0.14	43	8.43	63	1.98	51	2.15	10	0.44
Rs. 4-0	6	0.86	6	1.15	71	2.23	23	1.60	4	0.17
Rs. 4-8	1	0.20	38	1.19	1	0.07	1	0.05
Rs. 5-0	1	0.20	8	0.25	1	0.07	1	0.05
Rs 5-0 and over
Total	703	100.00	510	100.00	3,156	100.00	1,437*	100.00	2,203	100.00

*Excludes 17 piece-workers.

MARXISM IS DEAD

In the case of moulders and blacksmiths the position of greatest density is at the Rs. 1-8 to 2 interval ; in the case of fitters, machinists and carpenters, at the next higher interval, Rs. 2 to 2-8.

The following statement shows the average monthly earnings in all occupations including semi-skilled and unskilled workers in the engineering industry of the Bombay Presidency²² :

[TABLE]

²² *Report on Wages, etc., in the Engineering Industry, Bombay Presidency,*
p. 94.

General Averages of Percentage Attendance and Earnings in all occupations—
Engineering concerns—men only.

Area.	Number of persons employed.	Average percentage attendance.	Average daily earnings.		Average monthly earnings.	
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
1. Bombay City	30,134	84.7	1 13 1	41 0 11		
2. Bombay Suburban, Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri	2,330	80.0	1 10 7	42 7 10		
3. Ahmedabad City	980	89.0	1 7 5	35 5 6		
4. Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals.	1,840	85.8	2 8 2	56 2 6		
5. Broach and Surat	405	86.5	1 6 5	35 13 8		
6. East and West Khandesh	1,270	88.0	1 3 7	30 14 7		
7. Poona, Nasik and Ahmednagar	5,240	86.0	1 2 9	26 9 0		
8. Sholapur City	287	91.4	1 1 0	27 5 8		
9. Sholapur and Satara	434	91.3	1 0 3	24 8 6		
10. Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur and Kanara	3,169	90.7	1 10 0	38 12 5		
Presidency Proper	46,089	85.8	1 11 4	39 3 10		

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

MARXISM IS DEAD

An average wage of Rs. 39 a month is equal in purchasing powers to 312 R., or about 6 per cent less than the average earnings of factory workers in Russia, *plus* the socialised wage.

It is obvious that the manual worker in Russia earning 100 or 150 roubles a month cannot be leading an extremely prosperous life.

The figures of Indian wages quoted above relate to the engineering industry where wages are highest. But it should not be forgotten that our wage-statistics relate to operatives only; they do not include the salaries of managers, technicians and directors.

According to the report on wages, hours of work and conditions of employment in the textile industries in the Bombay Presidency (*General Wage Census, 1934. Part I, Third Report, 1937, p. 136*) the weighted average of daily earnings of all adult operatives in all occupations in all cotton textile mills and factories which were working in the Bombay Presidency Proper during the (wage) census year 1934, amounted to Re. 1-1-8 for a total of over a quarter million workers. Increase in wages amounting to 12 1/2 per cent was granted in 1938, which raises the average daily wage to about Re. 1-4-0. We convert the average daily into monthly wage according to the formula:

$$\frac{\text{Average daily earnings} \times \text{No. of working days in wage period} \times \text{figure for percentage attendance}}{100}$$

The general average of percentage attendance for all adult operatives in all textile cotton mills and factories was 89.1 (*see the same report, p. 142*) and it would be

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

correct to take the number of working days to be 25 in a month. The average monthly earnings therefore are :

$$\frac{\text{Rs. } 1.25 \times 25 \times 89.1}{100} = \text{Rs. } 27.8$$

At 8 roubles to the rupee these average monthly earnings are equal to 222 roubles. Mrs. Munshi, M.L.A. (Bombay), recently stated publicly at Delhi that "The Bombay Government had raised the minimum wage to Rs. 25 a month" (The *Statesman* of Calcutta, dated Tuesday, 28th March, 1939). A minimum wage of Rs. 25 is equal to 200 roubles in purchasing power. On the basis of statistics published by the Russian Trade Delegation in Great Britain in its report for December 1937, the *average* monthly earnings in light industry in Russia are 196.5 roubles ²⁴.

Average daily and monthly earnings of different classes of workers in the textile industries in the Bombay Presidency are given in the report on the wage census mentioned above. Average monthly earnings of some workers in occupations common to all cotton textile factories in the Bombay City area are given below (*Report*, pp. 153-55.) The information relates to May 1934, and does not take account of the increase in wages granted in 1938.

Occupation.	Rs. a.	Occupation.	Rs. a.
1. Sweepers ...	16 15	25 Boiler attendants II Class	48 12
2. Washermen ...	18 5	26 Steam engine drivers...	51 7
3. Gunny-bag sewers (men) ...	19 10	27 Saw-bench attendants	52 8
4 Engine and boiler cleaners ...	20 8	28 Superior apprentices ...	56 14
		29 Superior carpenters ...	58 13
		30 Superior moulders ...	59 13

24 Sir Walter Citrine, loc. cit., p. 388.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Occupation	Rs.	a.	Occupation	Rs.	a.
5 Lampmen ...	21	8	31 Plumbers ...	60	12
6 Hoistmen ...	22	6	32 Superior wiremen ...	62	7
7 Weighmen ...	22	11	33 Superior machinists ...	64	1
8 Watchmen ...	23	5	34 Superior fitters ...	64	10
9 Rivetters ...	24	0	35 Ordinary switchboard attendants ...	67	4
10 Pumpmen and filter-men ...	25	1	36 Boiler attendants I Class	69	15
11 Electric motormen ...	26	0	37 Carpenter mistries ...	71	3
12 Steam and electric crane drivers ...	27	9	38 All-round electricians	77	1
13 Sawyers ...	27	15	39 Welders ...	78	13
14 Water softeners ...	29	12	40 Superior motor mechanics ...	88	5
15 Valvemen ...	30	9	41 Oil engine drivers ...	89	13
16 Plant attendants ...	31	3	42 Chargemen ...	103	11
17 Jamadars ...	34	1	43 Superior armature winders ...	105	0
18 Naikins ...	35	12	44 Fitter mistries ...	108	0
19 Ordinary moulders ...	38	3	45 Superior switchboard attendants ...	117	0
20 Air compressor operators	40	6	46 Special machinists ...	121	13
21 Ordinary wiremen ...	41	7	47 Special fitters ...	127	7
22 Masons ...	42	13	48 Superior turbine drivers ...	187	8
23 Ordinary instrument mechanics ...	45	12			
24 Tinsmiths ...	46	15			

Below are given some of the statistics of wages quoted by Sir Walter Citrine and their equivalent in rupees, reckoning 8 roubles to the rupee.

Wages in No. 4 Children's Underwear Factory, situated near Moscow River.

Category	Roubles	Rupees
1	108	14
2	122	15
3	138	17
4	155	19
5	178	22
6	203	25
7	233	29
8	270	34

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

Rates of wages of the workers in the first National Kaganovitch Ball-Bearing Works in Moscow.

Piece-workers.			On piece-work at hot, difficult and unhealthy jobs with technically fixed norms.		
Category	Roubles	Rupees	Category	Roubles	Rupees
1	128	16	1	165	21
2	143	18	2	185	23
3	161	20	3	208	26
4	187	23	4	241	30
5	217	27	5	281	35
6	258	32	6	334	42
7	313	39	7	405	51
8	383	48	8	496	62

(*I Search for the Truth in Russia*, pp. 104 and 93.)

While the standard of living of the average Russian factory worker is several times lower than that of the British worker, it cannot be much higher than that of the average Indian factory worker. The lowest categories of Russian workers are very probably quite as miserable as the lowest categories of workers in India, if not more.

Russian wages are so low as to be incredible. The Russian worker, says Sir Walter Citrine, is able to live because of two additional factors, (a) the socialised part of his wage and (b) the family wage.²⁵

But the family wage is earned by the whole family—it is not the same thing as high wages earned by an individual member. And the socialised wage does not mean actual purchasing power.

The second is a point of some importance. In comparing Russian with Indian wages I have ignored the socialised wage in Russia. It is not actual purchasing power,

²⁵ Sir Walter Citrine, loc. cit., p. 334.

and it is difficult to estimate its amount exactly—probably it is not more than half of what it purports to be. Secondly, considerable deductions are made from the salaries of Russian workers. The deductions and the socialised wage cancel each other out.

Comrade Yvon thus enumerates the deductions :

Tax on wages properly so-called : from 0·67 to 3·3 per cent of wages. Those earning less than 150 roubles enjoy exemption.

Cultural tax for the maintenance of theatres, libraries, etc : from 0·93 to 2·8 per cent of wages.

Subscription to co-operatives : 1 to 2 per cent of wages.

Trade Union subscription (membership of trade unions is compulsory) : 2 per cent of wages.

State Loan (theoretically voluntary, but in fact compulsory) : 10 per cent of wages.

Subscription (in fact compulsory) for different workmen's associations : 1 per cent of wages.

“ This makes in all 15 to 21 per cent of wages, a sum which is deducted before wages are paid ; this is money which the worker never even sees ! The payment registers of no matter what factory may be inspected to verify this.”²⁵

If there was the slightest suggestion in India of workers lending to Government any portion of their monthly salary, an India-wide agitation would be started, with workers sitting *dharna* and their leaders ‘fasting unto death.’

Comrade Yvon considers the socialised wage ‘an

26 Yvon, loc. cit., p. 26.

enormous bluff' (*un bluff enorme*) : " Social insurance is only some favours which the all-powerful State patron grants or *does not grant* (italics Comrade Yvon's). It is its charity to *pariahs* whom he exploits." 27

Such is the meaning of dictatorship of the proletariat for the real Russian proletariat. We do not know the earnings of agricultural workers in Russia, how they have fluc-

27 Yvon, loc. cit., p. 39. W. P. Coates and Zelda K. Coates say (*From Tsardom to the Stalin Constitution*, George Allen, 1938) : " But the cash wages alone do not give a fair picture, since it is estimated that the value of the social insurance services to which the workers do not contribute add over 34 per cent to these wages " (p. 172). The impression is thus produced that the whole of this 34 per cent is a real addition to monetary wages. This is not so. De Basily says (p. 378) :—

" Despite the rather high total amount taken by the Soviet State for purposes of social insurance, this means of assistance—owing to the way in which it is organized—can do but little to improve the lot of the workers.

" Every factory manager or head of an undertaking is required to disburse, in addition to the total of the wages paid, a further amount, representing about 30 per cent of this total, and to pay this amount to the Treasury for purposes of social insurance. The State Bank distributes the sums thus received among the various relief institutions concerned.

" The total wages in the U.S.S.R. being estimated at 40,000 million roubles the said 30 per cent contribution yields the substantial sum of some 12,000 millions. Nevertheless, the expenditure item, 'For Social and Cultural Purposes,' does not exceed in the Soviet Budget 6,500 million roubles ! Thus, the State utilizes for other purposes nearly one-half of the money paid to the Treasury for the needs of social insurance ! "

The Soviet worker enjoys 12 days' paid holidays in the year—a right described as one of the 'conquests' of the Revolution. " In reality," says De Basily, " the cost this right involves is more than recouped by the workers' subscriptions to the State loans which, in fact, are compulsory and equivalent to a cash sacrifice by each worker from 15 to 30 days' wages " (p. 379). Further, Soviet workers are so poor that they are often compelled to seek work during their holidays period (*Ibid* p. 379 and Yvon, p. 30.) " The constant life of semi-poverty," says Yvon "*drives the head of the family to beg permission to work during his holidays . . .*" (*pousse le pere de famille a implorer* (italics Yvon's) *la permission de travailler pendant son conge*).

tuated since the Great War in terms of money, and how they have varied in terms of purchasing power. The Punjab has farm accounts, which are published every year, showing income and expenditure of holdings in several districts of the Province. One would be glad to obtain similar information about farms in the only socialist country in the world. Where is this information?

Official publications in the Soviet Union, meant for propaganda abroad, and works by admirers of the Soviet Union, are curiously silent on the question of purchasing power of different classes of workers in Russia. Not that wages are not mentioned. But they are mentioned in a way which will tell the reader nothing.

For example, explaining budget revenues in 1936, M. Grinko, the Soviet Commissar of Finance, mentioned the projected increase of over 7,000,000,000 roubles in the wages fund and the large increase in the monetary income of the collective farms and collective farmers.²⁸ The wages fund includes the wages of all workers, including the highest officials, the most important experts, and the shock-workers. An increase in the wages fund and in the income of collective farms and farmers does not, by itself, show that the proletariat, or the lower categories of workers are better off than before. The greater part of the increase may be appropriated by the higher-paid employees and officials, leaving the lower-paid workers very much in the same position as before.

The claim is made in the official *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* that there is no exploitation in Russia and that the productive forces there are develop-

²⁸ *Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 483.

ing rapidly.²⁹ But we look in vain for facts showing actual earnings of different categories of workers, and variations in real wages. Increase in the total pay-roll, which is duly mentioned, means nothing.³⁰ Real wages may have doubled for all classes of workers, or they may have not. Where are the facts? What was the money wage, or equivalent in money of the goods and services enjoyed by the lower-paid workers in, say, 1914 and in 1926? What is the money wage now? And how much

29 *History of the Communist Party*, pp. 126-27:—"The basis of the relations of production under the socialist system, which so far has been established only in the U. S. S. R., is the social ownership of the means of production. Here there are no longer exploiters and exploited. The goods produced are distributed according to labour performed, on the principle: 'He who does not work, neither shall he eat.' Here the mutual relations of people in the process of production are marked by comradesly co-operation and the socialist mutual assistance of workers who are free from exploitation. Here the relations of production fully correspond to the state of productive forces, for the social character of the process of production is reinforced by the social ownership of the means of production.

"For this reason socialist production in the U. S. S. R. knows no periodical crises of overproduction and their accompanying absurdities.

"For this reason, the productive forces here develop at an accelerated pace, for the relations of production that correspond to them offer full scope for such development."

30 *History of the Communist Party*, p. 340:—

"The spread of the Stakhanov movement and the fulfilment of the Second Five-Year Plan ahead of time created the conditions for a new rise in the standard of welfare and culture of the working people.

"During the period of the Second Five-Year Plan real wages of workers and office employees had more than doubled. The total pay-roll increased from 34,000,000,000 roubles in 1933 to 81,000,000,000 roubles in 1937. The State social insurance fund increased from 4,600,000,000 roubles to 5,600,000,000 roubles in the same period. In 1937 alone, about 10,000,000,000 roubles were expended on the State insurance of workers and employees, on improving living conditions and on meeting cultural requirements, on sanatoria, health resorts, rest homes and on medical service."

has the rouble depreciated in the interval? Give us the facts, and we shall find out for ourselves whether real wages are doubling in Russia at the end of every five years, or going down, in spite of the enormous increase in the pay-roll, or the wages fund, from year to year.

That the rouble has depreciated one is led to infer from incidental observations of travellers!³¹ Between 1926 and 1935 the purchasing power of the rupee increased, or the rupee appreciated on account of the heavy fall of prices. How much exactly the rupee appreciated can be determined by reference to the index numbers of prices, and those of cost of living.

Capitalist countries have the courage to publish statistics which the Fatherland of all socialists (wisely) suppresses.

The monumental work by the Webbs (*Soviet Communism*) gives no information about the standard of living or purchasing power of the various classes of workers in Russia. Evidently the matter is of no importance in an account of the 'new civilization'!

Pat Sloan contents himself with general observations on the standard of life in Russia. Neither wages nor prices are quoted anywhere! It appears to him that the working people in Russia are "better off than their fellow workers in Britain in a number of vital respects."³²

31 Sir Walter Citrine says (loc. cit), p. 104:—

"Model makers, practically all of whom were women, were paid 450 roubles. There were 1,100 employees altogether and their output last year was 9½ million roubles. They said this was about 5½ million at 1926 values. This, incidentally, gave me some indication of the extent of the depreciation of the rouble. On these figures the rouble in 1935 is worth only about three-fifths of what it was in 1926."

32 Pat Sloan, loc. cit., p. 107.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

Would British workers like to change places with Russian workers, given unemployment in Britain, periodic crises, exploitation by the bourgeoisie, and a thousand other discomforts and disadvantages ?

There is an extremely well got-up work by twenty-eight of the foremost citizens of the U.S.S.R., *The Soviet Comes of Age*, with a foreword by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. It contains charming photographs of new Government buildings, railway stations, theatres, and a specially interesting picture showing part of the share of a family of three on a collective farm : a man and a woman are standing in the midst of bags of corn. (Why give pictures when farm accounts would be more convincing ?). There is the following reference to wages in this joint-work :

“ The wages of the workers are increasing annually, as may be seen by a comparison of the total wages fund for a number of years. In 1933 it was 34,000 million roubles ; in 1935, 36,200 million roubles ; in 1937, 82,000 million roubles, and in 1938 it will be no less than 95,000 million roubles.

“ During the last ten years the real wages of the working people have increased by 300 per cent. This increase is a result of the State regulation of Soviet and Co-operative trade and the accompanying steady reduction in prices, which saved the working people a sum of 10,000 million roubles during the past five years.” ³³

33 *The Soviet Comes of Age*, pp. 173-74.

W. P. Coates and Zelda Coates (*From Tsardom to the Stalin Constitution*) in a chapter of their book entitled “ What Have the Workers Gained ? ” mention the fall of prices “ during the last few years,” side by side with increasing wages. The worker was better off in 1937 than in 1935 (p. 173). Is he better off now than in 1926-27 or in 1913, that is before there was any Revolution ? And why talk vaguely

MARXISM IS DEAD

The wages fund again ! Evidently it is a crime in Russia to discuss changes in individual rates of wages. The lot of the individual worker depends on the increase in the general wages fund !

Real wages are stated to have increased three times during the past ten years. Statements by Soviet writers have to be taken on trust ; we may as well believe that real wages in Russia have increased five or ten-fold.

Would the Soviet Government agree to an investigation into wages and changes in the purchasing power of various grades of income in the Soviet Union since 1913 by an international committee of inquiry composed of trained economists ? Not very likely. But workers of the world have a right to know the truth about Russia, their Fatherland.

FALL IN REAL WAGES.

The following statement shows the prices of seven foodstuffs in Russia in 1932 and in 1937. 'Normal' price means the ration price.³⁴

(ROUBLES PER KILO)

			Normal price, 1932.	Single price, 1937.
Rye bread	0 12½	0·85
Wheat bread	0·17½	1·00
Wheat flour	0·19	2·90
Buckwheat groats	0·25	2·50
Wheat (grain)	2·12	7·60
Butter	4·66	16·50
Sugar	0·95	4 00

of 'the last few years.' Tell us exactly how prices and wages stand today as compared with 1913 or 1926, that is before the building of socialism began. That would give us a more accurate idea of what the workers have gained by the Revolution and the building of socialism.

³⁴ Hubbard, loc. cit., p. 273.

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

In 1936 the average wage was 94 per cent higher than in 1932; thus from 100 in 1932 the average wage rose to 194 in 1932, but the cost of the seven commodities mentioned in the table rose from 100 to 417 (from 8·47 to 35·35R.) Purchasing power of the average wage, in terms of these commodities, fell by no less than 53 per cent, or by more than half.

The rise in the prices of foodstuffs will not be felt much by the higher income-groups, for the greater the income, the smaller is the proportion of the income spent on food. It is just the reverse in the case of the poorer classes.

Inquiries into working class family budgets in India show that about one-half of the family income is spent on food. The following statement is borrowed from the *Report on an Enquiry into Working Class Family Budgets in Ahmedabad*.³⁵

PERCENTAGE EXPENDITURE ON THE MAIN GROUPS

Groups.	Ahmedabad working class Family Budgets.		Bombay working class Family Budgets, 1932-33.
	1926.	1933-35.	
Food	57·90	49·31	46·60
Fuel and Lighting	7·04	6·65	7·11
Clothing, Footwear and Umbrellas	9·45	9·12	7·75
Bedding and household necessities	1·16	0·37	0·13
House rent	11·74	10·97	12·81
Miscellaneous	12·71	23·58	25·60
Total	100·00	100·00	100·00

³⁵ *Report on an Enquiry into Working Classes Family Budgets in Ahmedabad* (Bombay Labour Office, 1937), p. 33.

MARXISM IS DEAD

It is seen that in 1926 about 58 per cent of the family income of Ahmedabad workers was spent on food, and in 1933-35, 49·31 per cent as compared with 46·60 per cent by Bombay workers (1932-33). The fall in this proportion in Ahmedabad is a sign of the rise in the standard of living.

In Russia during the N. E. P. the cost of food was about 50 per cent of the total wages. Since then the proportion has risen.³⁶

PRINCIPAL ITEMS OF THE AVERAGE WORKMAN'S BUDGET (IN KOPECKS PER MONTH)

			Income			
	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935
Wages of head of family at <i>pro rata</i> of persons in family	2,675	3,450	4,149	4,740	5,995	7,637
For each member of family :—	Expenditure					
Food	1,627	2,142	2,913	3,787	4,004	5,137
Clothes and foot-wear ...	473	538	634	607	799	1,040
Lodging	198	234	238	280	331	386
Cultural needs	65	77	79	71	90	121
Hygiene and medical aid ...	26	24	37	47	62	84
Total	2,389	3,015	3,901	4,792	5,286	6,768
Percentage expenditure on food	60 8 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	62 1 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	70 2 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	79 9 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	66 8 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	67 3 ⁰ / ₁₀₀

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

That the proportion of the family income spent on food in Russia should have been as high as 67·3 per cent in 1935, as compared with 49·31 per cent in Ahmedabad and still less in Bombay, is in itself a sufficient proof of the extremely low standard of living of Russian workers.

When about two-thirds of the family income is spent on food, the rise in the cost of food in a proportion much higher than wages must mean privation and suffering.

Hubbard concludes: "While it is highly probable that the higher income groups in 1937 had the purchasing power and opportunity to buy a much larger selection of goods of all sorts, and particularly of luxury articles, than in 1928, it is doubtful whether the real wages of the lower paid wage earners enabled them to increase their consumption of the necessities of life, let alone of luxuries."³⁷

Hubbard's conclusion is confirmed by the independent testimony of others.

Comrade Yvon thus computes the purchasing power of money-wages in terms of rye-bread.³⁸

		Monthly salary of an average worker in roubles.	Price of a kilo- gramme of rye- bread in roubles.	Monthly pur- chasing power of the salary in terms of rye- bread. Kgs.
Pre-war	...	30	0·05	600
1925-27	...	100	0·125	800
1933	...	130	0·30	430
1934	...	150	0·50	300
1935	...	170	1·00	170
1936	...	190	0·85	225
1937	...	220	0·85	260

37 Hubbard, p. 288.

38 Yvon, p. 24.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Comrade Yvon explains that the price of wheaten bread is about double that of rye-bread. The shape of the curve would not change by substituting wheaten for rye-bread. But rye-bread has been taken as it is most largely consumed by Moscow workers. The wages quoted are also for Moscow workers.

It is seen that while real wages in terms of rye-bread rose between 1935 and 1937, in 1937 they were much below those for 1934, 1933, 1925-27, or before the war.

De Basily quotes the following prices ³⁹ :—

Articles. (per kilogramme = 2·2 lbs.)	Price in roubles.		Rise in 1935-36. 1913=100
	1913	1935-36.	
Rye-bread	7·3	19 1	261
Buckwheat groats ...	17·1	96·8	566
Meat ..	46 4	171·0	368
Butter	114·8	371 0	323
Granulated sugar ...	29·3	90·0	307

On an average, the prices of these five articles rose from 100 to 365, or a little more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ times. What was the rise in money wages during this interval?

The following monthly wages in gold roubles are given by De Basily * :—

³⁹ De Basily, loc. cit., p. 368.

* Ibid. p. 372.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

Years.			Gold Roubles.	Index 1913 = 100
1913	24·3	100
1924-25	43·5	179
1925-26	54·0	222
1926-27	60·4	248
1934	32·2	132
1935	41·6	171
1936	50·6	208

We are again confronted with the remarkable fact that money wages of the Russian worker were higher in 1926-27, when the building of socialism had not yet begun, than in 1936, and the almost incredible fact that real wages in 1936, when exploitation of man by man had ceased, were actually lower by more than one-third than in the days of capitalist exploitation, or in 1913 (208 : 165).

These are startling facts which would require a good deal of explaining away. It is incomprehensible why the flood of propagandist literature emanating from official sources in Moscow ignores this criticism. Are the facts regarding wages and prices quoted by Sir Walter Citrine, Hubbard, Yvon, and De Basily true? If they are false, why does not the Communist Party of the Soviet Union state the correct facts which would knock the bottom out of the critics' case? What is the value of general assertions regarding doubling and trebling of real wages in Russia, when the only evidence on which they are based is increase in the total wages fund?

De Basily says : "With wages of 150—200 roubles a month the worker is condemned to an existence which borders on misery."⁴⁰

40 De Basily, p. 380.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Mercier and others were struck by the look of dull despair on the colourless faces of poorer workers (*la morne désespérance de leur visages décolorés.*) Is that all that the Russian Revolution has achieved? ⁴¹.

Ceaseless propaganda is carried on by Government to convince Russian workers that they live better than workers in capitalist countries. Information about the social condition of workers in other countries is withheld from the people.⁴² But this state of things cannot go on for ever.

The proletariat, if they do not know how the British or the French worker lives, cannot shut their eyes to the

⁴¹ Mercier, loc. cit., p. 58.

⁴² According to Mercier the Government have erected a barrier around Russia to keep people ignorant of economic conditions in capitalist countries. But ignorance and lies are also dangerous (*l'ignorance et le mensonge présentent d'ailleurs aussi leurs dangers*, pp. 42-43, Mercier, loc cit.).

That the Soviet Government do carry on lying propaganda to deceive their workers is confirmed by others. Andrew Smith says: (*I was a Soviet Worker*, p. 45):—

“While we were conversing, the news got about that an American was at the Vassiliev's and the room was very quickly crowded with other workers, who fired numerous questions at me about conditions in America :

“How do the workers live in the United States? Do they live as we do? Are the posters showing the starvation and hunger in America true to life? What about the hunger-marches? How strong is the American Communist Party? When will there be a revolution in the United States? ”

“I told them there were many unemployed in America and many living on relief. But when I explained that my wife and I lived in a six-room house, with a white tiled bathroom, shower and toilet of our own, a radio and automobile, they gasped in amazement, especially when I told them that many workers lived this way.”

higher standard of living of the privileged classes⁴³ of their own country.

Is this society Marxian? Marxism does not exclude poverty for all. But it is inconsistent with privilege, class distinctions, and the domination of class by class.

43 The contrast between the style of living of different classes has been described by many who speak with intimate knowledge of Soviet Russia. One example will be sufficient. Andrew Smith says (loc. cit. pp. 45-47) :—

"Vassiliev and his wife lived in a room about twenty or twenty-five feet square. There were six beds in the room to accommodate the couple and four other tenants who lived in the room. The furniture was very scant, including a few chairs, a table and a chiffonier. For want of space a number of coats and dresses hung on the walls. They had no radio or pictures. . . .

"Compare this picture with what I saw elsewhere. One day a friend of mine, who worked in a Gay Payoo factory, asked me to visit him in an apartment house restricted to Gay Payoo officials. The Gay Payoo has its own plants worked exclusively by prison labour under the supervision of experts, technicians and guards. In the course of a number of visits, I was invited into the home of one of the leading Gay Payoo officials living in the same house. He wanted to talk to me about the United States.

"I was led into a gorgeous seven-room apartment equipped with its own kitchen and individual bathroom, with elevator service, telephones, steam heat, hot and cold water. My host lived there with his wife and two maid servants. The couple had no children. The apartment consisted of a salon, or sitting-room, a dining-room, two master bedrooms and one bedroom for the two servants, an office or workroom for the master of the house, a room for card-playing and dancing and a summer porch. The apartment was sumptuously furnished with thickly upholstered chairs, soft couches and expensive antiques. Scattered throughout the suite were small, hand-covered tables covered with beautifully coloured mosaics made of rare Ural stone. The parquet floors and the walls were covered with thick, hand-woven Oriental rugs. In odd corners one could see rich knick-knacks consisting of jewel boxes made of seashells, vases, hand-carved ash trays and Oriental bric-a-brac. From the ceiling in each room hung a heavy crystal chandelier. These were supplemented by more modern floor lamps, with cut-glass and silk-shades. The couple possessed a radio of Russian manufacture and a German phonograph. On the floors of the master bedrooms were thick white bear-skins. Rich Russian hand-

MARXISM IS DEAD

HOW THE GERMAN WORKER LIVES.

Indian Marxists particularly, and socialist leaders generally, not excluding Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, speak of Hitler with undisguised hostility and contempt. But Hitler has done at least as much for the German worker as Stalin for the Russian worker. Unfortunately, while India is inundated with Russian propaganda (and the average socialist in India reads nothing but propagandist

made draperies hung about the walls to complete the picture. It was the most luxurious apartment I had ever seen, richer even than the apartment of the wealthy businessman in Pittsburgh for whom my wife had worked as a cook.

"I found the lady of the house reclining in a soft easy chair in the sitting-room, reading a magazine. She held a gold tipped cigarette in her soft white fingers. I could see her highly rouged finger nails. She had not spared either lipstick or rouge in making herself ready for the occasion and her eyebrows were carefully plucked in the most up-to-date manner. Her bleached hair was permanently waved *a la mode*.

"Clad in a heavy, dark silk dress, cut very low, she wore silk stockings and high-heeled shoes to match. Occasionally she glanced at her imported gold wrist watch and toyed with her pearl necklace. Heavy gold earrings hung almost to her shoulders. Her fingers were heavily ringed. Altogether, by her appearance and manners, she looked to me like a prostitute.

"We were served in the brilliantly lighted dining-room with delicacies which I had not seen in the Soviet Union. There was real tea, served in delicate Oriental cups, and poured from an enormous steaming silver samovar. The knives, forks and spoons were apparently relics of the treasures of the defunct Russian aristocracy. There was a special silver service for each course. We had white bread, butter, caviare, cheese, fresh radishes, salami, fish, fresh fruit, apples, pears, raspberry compote, delicious Russian candies and pastry, and cognac of the most ancient vintage.

"In the course of the repast, my hostess consumed a most generous portion of the cognac. She began to laugh hysterically and talk in loud tones. As we left the house after our visit, I remarked sarcastically to my friend:

"'And this is what the Russian workers have to slave for. And they call this a workers' country.'

"'This is nothing,' my friend replied; 'you ought to see what goes on when they throw one of their Gay Payoo parties.'"

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

literature produced in Russia or by British socialists), very little information is available about economic conditions in Germany. Every one, however, knows that Hitler has annexed Austria and Czechoslovakia, and is preparing to fight Russia. That is enough to condemn Hitler and National Socialism. We are not concerned with the foreign policy of Hitler's Government. It has, perhaps, its justification in the attempt to humiliate a great people through the infamous treaty of Versailles. What interests us here is the success of national socialist planning in solving the problem of unemployment and in raising the real income of the German worker.

Unemployment is no longer a serious problem in Germany⁴⁴ and real wages of the German worker were higher in 1937 than in 1933.

44 C. W. Guillebaud in *The Economic Recovery of Germany* (Macmillan 1939, page 101) says:—

"By the autumn of 1936 the success of the First Four-Year Plan was no longer in doubt. Unemployment had ceased to be a serious problem and there was practically full employment in the building and engineering industries. The national income was rising steadily, and, allowing for the fall in prices, had reached the level of the boom year of 1928; industry and the banking system were fully liquid, and savings were coming forward increasingly in the capital market. Thus the economic circuit had been closed and the seemingly hazardous policy which was embarked on in 1932-33 had been vindicated by the result. Initially, the State orders provided the demand for work at a time when effective demand was almost paralysed and savings in the aggregate were non-existent; the Reichsbank supplied the money funds needed for investment; investment drew the unemployed into work; and work created the incomes, and therewith the savings, out of which the short-term indebtedness previously incurred was able to be carried and, in a certain measure, to be funded. The scepticism of the outside world, which, almost without exception, had refused to believe in the possibility of the German experiment succeeding, was proved to be unjustified. Recovery was no longer on paper; it was there for everybody to see."

MARXISM IS DEAD

The German Government, unlike the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the Soviet Union, have the courage to publish full information about prices, wages and the cost of living. In their fight with Communism they assign a different role to statistics than that conferred on statistics by Stalin in his fight against capitalism.

The general cost of living index number (food, housing, heating and lighting, clothing and miscellaneous) fell from 151·7 in 1928 (1913-14=100) to 125·5 in March, 1938, the fall in the cost of food being from 153·0 in 1928 to 122·3 in March, 1938.⁴⁵

Weekly earnings in various industries in 1937 are given below ⁴⁶ :—

		<i>R. M.</i>
Metal working industries	49·28
Chemical	49·78
Book-printing	59·86
Skilled linotype operators on night duty	110·00
Linen industry (male assistants)	20·00
Linen industry (female assistants)	14·50
Book-binding (skilled females)	27·70
All industries (skilled and semi-skilled males)	43·70
„ „ (male assistants)	33·50
„ „ (female workers)	21·80
General average (males and females)	36·30

These are gross wages. Deductions for social insurance, in taxes, subscriptions, etc., are estimated at 15 to 20 per cent of the gross wage. For all workers, then, while the average gross wage at the end of 1937 was 36·3 R.M. per week, the average net wage, after all deductions, was 29 R.M.

Guillebaud thus calculates the average real wage

⁴⁵ Guillebaud, loc. cit., p. 187.

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 190.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

(before deduction of taxation and insurance contributions, etc.) of the German industrial wage-earner⁴⁷ :—

July-December 1932=100.

		1933	1934	1935	1936	1937
Average weekly real earnings	106·7	111·4	114·2	117·7	121 8
Average hourly real earnings	104 4	104·9	106·3	107·2	108 9

It is seen that as compared with 1932 the weekly real earnings of the German industrial worker in 1937 rose by a little more than one-fifth. While we in India curse Hitler, the German worker has reasons to be grateful to Hitler and National Socialism for improvement in his material condition.

For purposes of comparison, says Guillebaud, 20 R.M. should be taken as equal to £1, though the officially quoted rate is 12 R.M.=1£. 1 R.M. is thus equal to 1s. A weekly net wage of 29 R.M. is equal to a monthly wage of 116s; the average wage in Russia, including one-third socialised wage, and making no deductions on account of taxation, subscriptions, monthly loan to Government, etc. is 333 R., equal to 83s. at 3*d.* to the rouble. The difference between the purchasing power of the German and the Russian worker is actually greater than is indicated by the proportion 116: 83. As for the German worker, net wages should be taken in the case of the Russian worker; the average wage in roubles is thus reduced from 250 R. to 200 R. Then, a considerable portion of the socialised wage is purely fictitious—the real socialised wage is not one-third of 250 R., or 83 R., but probably about half of this—say 45 R. (strictly speaking, we should leave out the

47 Guillebaud, loc. cit., pp. 190-91.

MARXISM IS DEAD

socialised wage altogether, since we are ignoring the social benefits enjoyed by the German worker). Erring in favour of the Russian worker, we find that his average wage is 245 R., or 61s. a month as compared with the German's 116s. Roughly the purchasing power of the average German worker under national socialism is twice as great as that of the average worker in Russia under socialism or 'communism.'

If the Soviet Union is proud of her achievements in raising the level of national well-being, National Socialist Germany, it would seem, has not much to be ashamed of either !

PIECE-WAGES

We return to Marxism in Russia, or Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

Productivity of labour in Russia has rapidly increased since 1935. This is due to three factors :—(i) the re-introduction of a money economy, (ii) piece-wages, and (iii) the Stakhanov movement. These three factors are mutually interacting. Piece-wages would lose much of their incentive if goods were sold at different prices to different classes of consumers ; and the Stakhanov movement could not have developed without the stimulus of piece-wages.

When prices are the same for all classes of workers, and when wages are paid in money alone and increase progressively with the productivity of the worker, the stimulus of material gain will cause the worker to exert himself to the utmost.

And the Soviet worker is working harder than ever before. The effect of money wages, combined with

RUSSIA: THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

progressive piece-rates, has been electrical.

Molotov (Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars) said on January 10th, 1936: "The interest of the workers in increasing their wages was of no little importance in the development of the Stakhanov movement, and in fact the earnings of the Stakhanovites began to attain record proportions."⁴⁸

A woman weaver, E. V. Vinogradova, earned 216 roubles a month when she worked on 26 looms. After joining the Stakhanov movement she took on 100 looms, and after that 144 looms* "Very soon we were invited to attend the conference of Stakhanovites of Industry and Transport. There in the presence of Comrade Stalin, I promised to take on 208 looms. I have fulfilled my promise (loud applause). I am now tending 216 looms."⁴⁹ She earned 1,185 roubles a month, or more than five times what she earned before.

⁴⁸ *Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 68.

*Accounts of record outputs attained by individual Stakhanovite workers are very often exaggerated. Stories are told of Stakhanovite brick-layers who laid from 10,000 to 25,000 bricks in a single shift of 7 hours, or say about one brick per second. According to Sir Walter Citrine, a British brick-layer who laid from 600 to 700 bricks a day, would give eminent satisfaction. Russian workers, who can turn out 10 to 25 times as much work of the same quality in the same time under the same conditions must be supermen. They are a myth.

Or take the woman weaver, Vinogradova, who was tending 216 looms in 1936 according to her own statement in a public meeting, which no one contradicted. Sir Walter Citrine tells us that not long ago a serious wages dispute arose in Lancashire over the employers' insistence that workers should operate 8 looms (*I Search for the Truth in Russia*, p. 403). And Vinogradova actually tended 216 looms! Are these looms toy looms? Or do threads never break in a socialist economy? Without assistance it is impossible for a single weaver to tend 216 automatic looms, unless he or she possesses many pairs of eyes, arms and legs.

⁴⁹ *Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 724.

MARXISM IS DEAD

In the month of August, 1935, before the Stakhanov movement, the output of coal in the Donbas amounted to 5,500,000 tons. In December of the same year, when the Stakhanov movement had already developed, the output increased to 7,125,000 tons. In December, 1923, the Donbas produced 1,604,000 tons of coal in all, that is less than the increase of output achieved by the Stakhanov movement in December, 1935, as compared with August of the same year.⁵⁰

One more example may be given to illustrate the wonderful effects of the monetary stimulus and progressive piece-rates. The superintendent of the First Machine Shop of the Stalin Diesel Works reported that on the very first day the Stakhanovite shift fulfilled its programme 155 per cent. whereas formerly it used to fulfil it 46,53 and 53 per cent.⁵¹

According to Molotov, in regard to the average level of productivity and cost of production, Russia is 'still lagging considerably behind America and Europe.'⁵² But before the introduction of the new system things were much worse. The 'chase after the rouble' has filled socialist Russia with a new hope—that of overtaking and surpassing the foremost capitalist country in productivity.

Even more than that. At present the principle of distribution is not needs of the worker but the work which he performs for society, and there is a considerable difference between the wages of mental and manual workers. The Soviet Union hopes to be able to abolish the distinction between mental and manual labour and to introduce distribution according to needs when the pro-

⁵⁰ *Soviet Union*, 1936, pp. 64-5. ⁵¹ *Ibid.* 1936, p. 113. ⁵² *Ibid.* p. 75.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

ductivity of the Russian worker has increased sufficiently. Socialism will then be transformed into communism. According to Stalin, the Stakhanov movement is 'preparing the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism.'⁵³ Or, as Mezhaulk (Chairman of the State Planning Commission) puts it : "The Stakhanov movement signifies that the process of eliminating the contrast between mental and physical labour is under way and that the universally developed individual is in the making."⁵⁴

The Stakhanov movement is known by the name of A. G. Stakhanov, a coal-hewer of the Donetz coal-field.

What type of men are Stakhanovites? They are men, says Stalin, 'who are able to appreciate the time factor in work, and who have learnt to count not only the minutes, but also the seconds'⁵⁵.

One may learn to count not only the seconds but fractions of a second when the rate of wages rises progressively with the increase of output.

The following example of the Soviet method of paying wages is taken from a speech by Kaganovich, Soviet Commissar of Railways.

For a standard run averaging 2,100 kilometers a month for the railways as a whole, engine drivers receive 22 kopeks per km.; if they exceed the monthly standard run, they receive 44 kopeks for an excess up to 10 per cent, and 66 kopeks per km. for an excess of over 10 per cent.⁵⁶

Exceeding the standard monthly run by over 10 per cent increases the standard rate of wages three-fold.

I doubt if such progressive piece-rates are employed

⁵³ *Soviet Union*, 1936, p. 5.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 331.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* p. 193.

anywhere else in the world.

It is easy to understand that Russian workers are most interested in being transferred from the time system to the piece-rate system, and from the group or brigade piece-rate system to the individual piece-rate system. The disadvantage of the collective group or brigade piece-rate system is that Stakhanovist shock workers are defrauded of part of their earnings for the benefit of inferior and negligent workers.

Marx condemned the piece-rate system. The piece-wage, according to Marx, is 'a form of wage-payment best suited to the capitalist system of production' (*der Stuecklohn die der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise entsprechendste Form des Arbeitslohnes ist.*)⁵⁷

Trotsky has reason on his side when he charges the Soviet Union with employing the piece-work system 'in such naked and crude forms as would not be permitted even by reformist trade unions in bourgeois countries.' Trotsky, again, is not wrong in saying that when wages are paid according to piece-rates, 'the rhythm of labour is determined by the chase after the rouble.'⁵⁸

In the lower phase of communism, which is socialism, workers are not paid according to their needs. There is inequality, which Marx recognized. But did Marx con-

⁵⁷ *Das Kapital*, Kautsky's ed, Vol. I, p. 491; Kerr ed., Vol. I, p. 608: "From what has been shown so far, it follows that piece-wage is the form of wages most in harmony with the capitalist mode of production." 'Best suited to' is more literal. There is no 'Harmonie' or 'Einklang' in the original.

Marx's discussion of piece-wages would be read with interest today. Does he say anywhere that piece-wages are a form of wages 'most in harmony with' or 'best suited to' the socialist mode of production?

⁵⁸ *The Revolution Betrayed*, pp. 83-84.

template the payment of wages according to piece-rates under socialism ?

Marx stated his position clearly in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, so clearly indeed that it is impossible to associate the Stakhanov system with socialism or Marxism.

It is a mistake to think that under socialism the worker will be entitled to receive as wages his whole proceeds of labour. Certain necessary deductions have to be made from the product of labour. They are, first, cost of replacing worn-out capital, of new investments, and of reserve or insurance funds to provide against misadventures, disturbances through natural events, and so on. Secondly, deductions have to be made to meet the general cost of administration not appertaining to production, the cost of the beneficent departments of the State, *e.g.*, education, public health, and of funds for those unable to work. What is left after these necessary deductions is available for distribution as wages.

What will be the principle of distribution under socialism, according to Marx ? Labour. The worker will receive from society, with the deductions mentioned above, 'exactly what he gives'—that is, labour. The social working day, Marx explains, consists of the sum of the individuals' hours of work. The working time of the individual labourer is 'that part of the social working day contributed by him, his part thereof. He receives from society a voucher that he has contributed such and such a quantity of work (after deductions from his work for the common fund) and draws through his voucher on the social storehouse as much of the means of consumption as the same quantity of work costs.' This is an

exchange of 'equal values'—'equal quantities of labour in one form are exchanged for equal quantities of labour in another form.' ⁵⁹

Earnings would be unequal—this Marx admitted. But still there is equality in the sense that every one is paid according to the same standard, labour. Marx says: "The right of the producers is *proportional* to the amount of labour they contribute; the equality consists in the fact that everything is measured by an *equal measure*, labour" (*italics Marx's*). ⁶⁰

It is obvious that Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* is thinking of distribution in the first or lower phase of communism in terms of labour, not in terms of the productivity of labour.

Labour and the productivity of labour mean two different things. If I am paid according to the quantity of work I turn out, productivity is the standard of payment. My employer is interested, not in my labour but its result. The piece-work system of wages is not the labour standard; otherwise one will have to make the absurd admission that wherever in the capitalist world wages are paid by the piece, the Marxian labour standard is in operation!

Perhaps the reader will say: How else can we measure labour except by its result? Well, if we have no other measure for labour than productivity, then the labour standard is pure bunkum. If even in a socialist regime labour cannot be measured and paid for in terms of its intensity and duration, then socialist distribution might as well be called capitalist distribution—and that is the end of the matter.

⁵⁹ *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 29.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* p. 30.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

The reader will also note that Marx talks of a 'voucher.' Lenin in his commentary on the same passage uses the word 'certificate' ⁶¹. In the Soviet Union no labour vouchers or certificates are used as means of payment, but money. Money is also a voucher and a certificate, but not in the Marxian sense.

If the reader disagrees, he may explain why Marx, in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, introduces a 'voucher' at all and why Engels in his criticism of Herr Duchring talks scathingly of a money economy.⁶²

He may explain why Marx and Engels did not simply say that in the first phase of communism everything would be measured by an equal measure, labour, when wages were paid in money according to the productivity of labour, the rate of wages rising progressively with increase in productivity.

Marxism, evidently, is not what Marx wrote, but what Russia does !

The Taylor system is severely condemned by Russian economists. Taylorism transforms the worker into 'an automaton, into a soulless accessory to a machine ;' ⁶³ it causes an extraordinary tension of the nervous system, which results in 'very widespread nervous complaints among the working class.' ⁶⁴ But transplant Taylorism to Russia, and lo and behold ! its character immediately changes. The Stakhanovists produce more and more per hour, and per minute and per second, breaking all world records. And yet they feel no strain. Why? Because

⁶¹ *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 88. ⁶² *Anti-Duehring*, pp. 339-41.

⁶³ *Outline of Political Economy*, by Lapidus and Ostrovityanov (Martin Lawrence, 1929), p. 87. ⁶⁴ *Ibid.* p. 88.

they know they are the builders of socialism, of a new society, of a new civilization. They are continually counting the seconds, and their money wages per second, but in the interests of socialism, for the good of humanity, not for themselves. Socialism in Russia, or 'Soviet Communism,' has changed human nature already! The miracle is working!

"Piece-work under capitalism," another Soviet economist explains, "is the favourite method of increasing the exploitation of workers by increasing the intensity of their labour."⁶⁵ The same piece-work system in the Soviet Union has altogether a different meaning⁶⁶:—

"The piece-work form of remuneration has an entirely different significance in the conditions obtaining in the U.S.S.R. There the worker does not sell his work to a class of exploiters, but uses it in enterprises which are the property of the proletarian State. The wage which the worker receives in the U.S.S.R. is a social allowance for labour, and is in proportion to the quantity and quality of the labour expended. Piece-work remuneration in the socialist economy of the Soviet Union is the best means of establishing conformity between the quantity and quality of the labour expended and the remuneration of the individual workman, it is a powerful lever in raising the productivity of labour and in addition the well-being of the working class. Therefore, it is entirely different from piece-work under capitalism."

We agree. Not only piece-work but everything is 'entirely different' in the Soviet economy. Ranks, privilege, bureaucracy, class-differentiation, have a meaning

⁶⁵ *Political Economy*, by A. Leontiev (Martin Lawrence), p. 113.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 113-14.

RUSSIA : THE GRAVE-DIGGER OF MARXISM

‘entirely different’ from that under capitalism. Even the starvation wages of unskilled workers, amounting to 100—150 roubles (Rs. 12½ to Rs. 18¾) are different from starvation wages in India. Why? There is no exploitation and no exploiter in the Soviet Union. Poverty itself, in the Soviet economy, has an ‘entirely different’ meaning from that under capitalism. It means prosperity, contentment, bliss !

Lapidus and Ostrovityanov tell us why it became necessary in the Soviet Union to ensure that the very forms of wages should incite workers to increased diligence, and continue :—

“ Obviously, in distinction from the capitalist system these measures are of a temporary character in Soviet Russia ; as the socialist consciousness of the worker is developed and as the old individualist outlook is outlived, both piece-work and the compulsory minimum standard will become unnecessary.” ⁶⁷

They will become unnecessary when the individualist outlook which piece-work payment engenders and develops has prepared the way for Communism ! Individualist outlook in Russia has also acquired a meaning ‘entirely different’ from that under capitalism. In capitalist countries, the individualist outlook is the very antithesis of communism. In Russia, it is the twin-brother of communism ! The more intensively the Stakhanovists live unto themselves, the more money they earn and the more wealth they accumulate, the nearer will the Soviet Union approach the ideal society of Marx. It is wonderful ! Who can say, after this, that Marxism is dead ? Marxism lives—in Russia !

67 Lapidus and Ostrovityanov, loc. cit., pp. 132-33.

CHAPTER VI

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

Like Marxian Socialism 'Indian Socialism' is also founded on a dialectic. It is not a dialectic of my own, but that of Malthus and Darwin, or the dialectic of the universal struggle for existence.

The dialectic of the struggle for existence is essentially different from the dialectic of the class-struggle. 'Indian Socialism,' recognizing the struggle for existence, must absolutely and utterly repudiate the whole ideology arising out of the conversion of money into capital, or the ridiculous passage of quantity into quality, and the dictatorship of the proletariat ending in the 'withering away' of the State, or the still more ridiculous negation of the negation.

The struggle for existence explains many a riddle.

It explains why Russia, claiming to follow Marx, has forgotten the world revolution ¹.

1 The U.S.S.R., "which is the cradle of the revolutionary struggle all over the world" (*New Data for Lenin's Imperialism*, by Varga and Mendelssohn, Lawrence and Wishart, 1939, p. 301), is willing to live on terms of peace with capitalism, and even with Fascism, if only Fascism would let the U.S.S.R. alone. Expression to this laudable sentiment was thus given by Maxim Litvinov, the Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. in a speech delivered on November 28th, 1936, at the extraordinary eighth Congress of Soviets of the U.S.S.R.

"In becoming the bulwark of democracy and freedom, the Soviet Union does not, however, call for the creation of an international bloc to struggle against Fascism, which rejects democracy and freedom. We, as a State, are not concerned with the internal Fascist regime of this or that country. Our collaboration with other countries and our participation in the League of Nations are based on the principle of the peaceful co-existence of two systems—the socialist and

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

It explains why there is no withering away of the State in Russia, in spite of the Russian claim that socialism has been achieved.

It explains the rise of Fascism, and why Fascist countries want war, when France wants Peace, when Britain wants Peace, and when the Soviet Union wants nothing but Peace ! Peace !! Peace !!! ².

the capitalist—and we consider that the latter includes the Fascist system. But Fascism is now ceasing to be an internal affair of the countries which preach it. . . .

“However, we are not in the least intimidated by this foreign activity of Fascism. It represents a real and a great danger for other countries, for their very existence, but not for us. We can easily cope with it on Soviet territory—(applause)—with our own forces, and we are not going to ask for foreign assistance to combat it or conclude international alliances and agreements for this purpose. (Laughter and applause.)”

(*Against Aggression*, by Maxim Litvinov, London Lawrence and Wishart, 1939, pp. 63-64.)

2 Thus Maxim Litvinov : (Ibid. p. 78):—

“The Soviet Union sees no grounds for changing her policy, which was, is, and will be a policy for peace. (Prolonged applause.) She wants this peace for herself and for other nations and, therefore, offered them her co-operation. She expects, not mere words about peace from others, but actions in organizing this peace.

“The Soviet Union, however, does not beg to be invited to any unions, and blocs, any combinations. She will calmly let other States weigh and evaluate the advantages which can be derived for peace from close co-operation with the Soviet Union, and understand that the Soviet Union can give more than receive. (Applause.)”

From the applause with which the Soviet audience greeted their Commissar's longing for peace, it may be inferred that the Bolsheviks share that longing. On another occasion Maxim Litvinov said : “In the roll-call of States which are interested in the preservation and consolidation of peace, its [Soviet State's] reply is always ‘Present’ !” (Ibid. p. 17).

The ‘base of the world revolution’ answers ‘Present’ ! Shades of Marx, Engels and Lenin, shout ‘Hallelujah’ in Heaven. The world revolution is near at hand !

MARXISM IS DEAD

It explains why the idea of a world socialist economy will never take practical shape, although all the contradictions of capitalism may be resolved in such an economy.

It explains why there will never be an international civil war, why workers of the world will never unite, why British and French labour will fight shoulder to shoulder with their bourgeoisies in defence of their Empires, and why even the Soviet Government will fight to the last rather than give up a foot of their territory ³.

It explains why the non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi, as that of Lenin, is a joke.

It explains all the great wars of the past that have made history, and the present political situation which is driving Europe toward war.

The struggle for existence finally explains Imperialism, both ancient and modern.

What is meant by the struggle for existence?

It is a biological conception.

There is incessant struggle in nature and this struggle, in the case of the animal kingdom, is very often of an extremely violent and deadly character. Its chief result is the elimination of the weak and survival of the fittest.

3 In the concluding portion of his speech at a meeting of the electors of the Petrograd and Vassily Ostrov Districts of Leningrad, on November 27th, 1937, Maxim Litvinov said (*Ibid.* p. 108):—

"They know that the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union does not depend on international combinations, but is grounded on the unflinching, growing power of the Red Army, Red Navy and Red Air Force. They know that our leader, Comrade Stalin, in his numerous cares for the proper functioning of the whole State machine, devotes most attention to questions of defence, to the questions of defending every foot of our ground, which no one must or can take from us. (Applause.)"

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

The organism fittest to survive is the organism which, in view of the conditions under which the struggle for existence is carried on, possesses the adaptations most favourable to victory. These adaptations may consist in the sharpest teeth and claws or the greatest cunning.

"There is no exception to the rule," wrote Charles Darwin, "that every organic being naturally increases at so high a rate, that, if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered by the progeny of a single pair." Over-production is a law of nature. An example given by Darwin may be quoted here. In the case of the elephant, the slowest breeder of all known animals, Darwin calculated that the progeny of a single pair would number 19 millions in 740 to 750 years, assuming that the elephant begins breeding when 30 years old and goes on breeding till 90 years old, bringing forth six young in sixty years. A more striking example is furnished by oysters. Oysters commonly produce 16,000,000 eggs (some fishes even more). It has been calculated that if all the progeny of one oyster survived and multiplied, their number until there were great great grand-children, would be 66,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000, and the heap of shells would be eight times the size of the earth.

Such being the natural law of over-production, slaughter on an immense scale is necessarily also a law of nature. In the case of plants, the struggle for existence goes on passively; between animals it is both passive and active. When different animals seek the same food, and the supply is insufficient, a merciless war of destruc-

tion, very often of tooth and claw, ensues, and the losers die out or change their mode of life.

Man, as part of organic nature, is subject to the law of over-production.

The population of Germany increased from 35.4 millions in 1850 to 64.9 millions in 1910, the annual rate of increase being 1.019 per cent. In the same period the population of England and Wales increased from 18.0 millions to 36.1 millions and that of Russia from 61.0 millions to 130.8 millions. The annual rate of increase during 60 years in England and Wales was 1.17 per cent and in Russia 1.28 per cent.

If we assume that 1.0 per cent is a normal rate of increase for a people (between 1921 and 1931 Indian population increased at the annual rate of 1.02 per cent), then population must double at the end of every 70 years in the absence of checks, positive or preventive.

Assume now that population is increasing steadily at the rate of 1 per cent per annum in India and Russia. Russia would reach a total of 2,000,000,000 (world population in 1931) in 255 years, and India in 175 years. If the Russian rate of increase was 1.28 per cent per annum, what it has been in the past, the population of Russia would equal the total world population in 1931 in 198 years.

Are we joking? No. Even Russia could not maintain her present rate of increase for 200 years. And actually, taking long periods into consideration, the population of India does not increase rapidly. Between 1870 and 1930, the rate of growth in India was slowest as compared with the leading countries of Europe, France alone excepted.

But our population does tend to increase rapidly. That the growth of numbers is cut short in alternate decades by famines and epidemics is not a contradiction of the Malthusian law, but its confirmation.

Both in Italy and Japan population is increasing at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. Growing numbers require more food and material requisites of well-being. And they want more living room, more land.

Their territory being restricted, why do not Germany, Italy and Japan restrict the growth of numbers? Well, if the Russians obey God's commandment: 'Be fruitful and multiply', why not Germans, Japanese and Italians? In certain countries, as in India and Japan, voluntary limitation of births is easier to preach than to practise. True, the Fascist countries have no room for expansion. But they can create it at the cost of the 'haves.' Is it a dispensation of God that three-fifths of the entire land surface of the globe shall be the monopoly of Russia, France and Britain?

ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE OVER-POPULATION

Now I know what the reader is going to say: Man is not like plants and other animals. 'An abstract law of population exists for plants and animals only, and only in so far as man has not interfered with them.'⁴

This is not true. The law of over-production has precisely the same meaning in the case of man as in that of plants and the lower animals. The fact that 'animals are at most *gatherers* whilst men are *producers*'⁵ does not

⁴ *Capital*, Vol. I, Kerr ed., p. 693.

⁵ Engels' letter to Lavrov. Engels refers to Darwin as 'a so-called natural scientist'—the all-wise Engels! Read Darwin and then Herr Engels—it is like watching the antics of a clown in a circus after the exit of the artist.

make any vital difference.

Marx's own law of over-population, based on the progressive decline in the variable constituent of capital as capitalist accumulation proceeds, is no law of over-population. At best Marx has explained how unemployment in industrial countries increases and decreases. Over-population in the Marxian sense constantly appears and constantly disappears with the worsening and improvement of conjuncture respectively. This conception of fluctuating over and under-population has nothing to do with the growing pressure on the means of subsistence in the absolute sense with the growth of numbers.

Let us first take the world as a whole, though it is not our business to solve world problems—we are concerned solely with India. Should the total world population continue to increase at the rate of 1 per cent per annum, it is certain that at the end of a few hundred years serious pressure would begin to be felt on world's resources in the matter of food, even in the narrowest interpretation of the term.

But it is idle to calculate the future growth of world population in relation to world food supply. What is pertinent to our enquiry is the natural resources of particular countries in relation to their numbers.

These resources, in particular cases, *e.g.*, Italy, Germany and Japan are inadequate. They cannot support growing numbers without a lowering of the standard of living of large masses of people.

The difficulty cannot be solved by a change of economic system. Socialism cannot transform the mountainous area of Japan, for example, into smiling fields of corn.

In answer it is often vaguely stated that scientific

development of resources in a socialist economy will increase productive power a hundred-fold or a thousand-fold. It is not realized that in the matter of food and raw materials, nature is still master.

Plants require space. An indefinite number of plants cannot grow in a given area.

A single wheat plant cannot bear an indefinite number of ears of corn. The weight of the corn will prevent the plant from standing upright. It is possible to increase the yield of corn without causing an over-luxuriant growth of stem and leaf, but not to an unlimited extent.

Plant growth depends on the elements of nutrition which the plant can draw from the soil. The soil of a country may be naturally deficient in some elements.

Increased knowledge has made the control of 'soil reaction' increasingly scientific, but the time will probably never come when the use of chemical fertilizers would supply any deficiency in the chemical constituents of the soil to any extent.

Nor is it possible to hope that the difficulty may be met by synthetic food. Vitamins may be made synthetically but not proteins. Measures for the increase of food production, which are of any value from the practical point of view, 'are essentially limited.'

More milk may be obtained from a cow and more eggs from a hen. But in this matter also 'the victory is still with nature.'

That is the verdict of men of science, who are competent to deliver judgment ⁶. Of course we may dream

⁶ See, for example, *Unsolved Problems of Science*, by A. W. Haslett (G. Bell, 1935), pp. 296-98.

of a state of things in which synthetic food in the form of a tiny pill swallowed in the morning, and another pill swallowed in the evening, will provide all the nutrition that the human body requires: we may dream of a society in which not only necessities but articles of comfort and luxury will be produced in such abundance that every one will have the finest cigars to smoke, the choicest wines to drink, the most powerful and luxurious cars to go about in, etc. etc. All that is utopia, far, far, removed from reality. At present, in the given stage of scientific knowledge, no conceivable change in the 'mode of production' will enable the Japanese to maintain their present standard of living if they were driven out of territories outside Japan which they have seized. If population continues to increase, they will seek room for expansion wherever they can find it—chiefly in the thinly-peopled parts of the globe. It is in their interest to do so. Obviously it is not in the interest of their victims. That is why there are wars. Force decides who shall stay and survive. To preach sermons on non-violence, to express indignation and horror at unprovoked acts of aggression is pointless. The whole process of survival of the fittest throughout nature is horribly cruel.

Our case is different. Our whole philosophy of life is and has been based during the past thousand years on *ahimsa*. Such people do not deserve to live. The Hindu would have disappeared from the face of the earth long ago but for the fact that our conquerors through the ages, moved by pity and self-interest, did not exterminate us. They let us live. And we lived and multiplied, and we live and multiply and carry on a dishonoured, despised existence which is worse than extinction.

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

We may be proud of our philosophy of life and our political status, but what right have we, slaves, to blame Japan, Italy and Germany, for thinking and acting differently? A virile people cramped for room, will expand. And woe to the weak! This is the Law of Nature. The 'haves' call it barbarism. But for 'have-nots,' expansion is an economic necessity—it is a means of leading a civilized, comfortable, cultured life. Compare, for example, the general standard of knowledge, intelligence, culture and comfort in England with that in India. The total revenue of the Central and Provincial Governments in India is considerably less than the annual cost of the social services alone in England. The Englishman's prosperity is due to his Empire. Take away the colonies and dependencies from England, reduce England to the status of an island kingdom as she was 350 years ago, and England will become poor again. Socialism will not win markets for England abroad or create foreign investments, the income from which adds strength to her balance of payments.

IMPERIALISM AS THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM

This view of expansion, war, conquest and imperialism is based on imperious necessity having its roots in the growth of numbers. But there is also another explanation of imperialism in terms of 'the mode of production.' Viewed from the Marxian angle imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism.

The secrets of the capitalist mode of production were revealed by Marx and Engels, but both passed away before the rise of the monopolistic period of capitalism. Lenin carried forward the work of Marx and Engels. He did not discover any new principles nor did he abolish any

of the old principles of Marxism. But he developed Marxian dialectic and extended its sphere. According to Stalin, Lenin made a fundamental Marxian analysis of imperialism as the final phase of capitalism ; " he exposed its ulcers and the conditions of its inevitable doom." Leninism is " Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions." ⁷

The economies of large-scale production, both external and internal are well known. They arise from the use of machinery in production. Modern capitalism has created large-scale enterprise. As capitalism grows the size of the business unit tends to increase. This is now as true of agriculture as of manufacture. Marx and Engels did not live to see the revolution in agricultural methods which the use of machinery has brought. It began when Lenin was living, but in 1916, in which year Lenin wrote his book, *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, the use of agricultural machinery was very much restricted even in the United States, the country which invented agricultural machines.

The growth in the size of the business unit leads to concentration in production. This takes the shape of huge kartels and trusts which dominate production. Small businesses are not completely crushed out, but they are of ever-decreasing significance. A tendency towards monopoly undoubtedly exists. Concentration affects banks as well. In the place of small independent banks, huge banking corporations arise with numerous branches. The bank capital of the country tends to be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands—the reader will be reminded of the "Big Five" in England. There is at the same time

⁷ *Leninism*, by J. Stalin, Vol. II, pp. 43-4.

the merging of merchant capital and industrial capital with bank capital. Finance capital is thus created. Finance capital, under the control of a microscopic minority of the population, is ever seeking fresh avenues of profitable employment, both at home and abroad. Creditor nations earn a very considerable income from foreign investments.

Before the Great War the chief creditor nations were England and France, and of less importance, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland. The leading creditor nation now is the United States, followed closely by England and, at a respectable distance, by France and Holland.

The export of capital plays an important part in developing the resources of colonial countries. British capital invested in India exceeds Rs. 1,000 crores. Enormous sums will be invested by Italy in Abyssinia to improve means of communication and transportation and to encourage the production of food and raw materials, which investment, in course of time, will become a source of income to Italy.

Capitalists of different countries combine to exploit the world market. Cut-throat competition among different national trusts and kartels is followed by the formation of international monopolies, or agreements regarding the control of output, prices and the division of the world market.

We are now in a position to understand the essential features of imperialism as defined by Lenin.

“(1) The concentration of production and capital developed to such a stage that it creates monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life.

MARXISM IS DEAD

"(2) The merging of bank capital with industrial capital and the creation, on the basis of 'finance capital', of a financial oligarchy.

"(3) The export of capital, which has become extremely important, as distinguished from the export of commodities.

"(4) The formation of international capitalist monopolies which share the world among themselves.

"(5) The territorial division of the whole world among the greatest capitalist powers is completed."⁸

The territorial division of the world among the greatest capitalist powers is completed, but it is not final. Imperialist wars cause redistribution of territory. Such was the result of the Great War. It is not unlikely that the next few years will witness important colonial readjustments.

This explanation of imperialism rests entirely on the 'mode of production'—the emergence of finance capital, the formation of international monopolies, and the fight for markets which results in war and conquest, all have their origin in the 'mode of production.'

The causes of imperialism are still economic, but unconnected with the tendency of population to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence. Throughout the discussion of imperialism by Lenin there is not a single reference to the Darwinian struggle for existence, or that 'Master in Plagiarism,' Parson Malthus.

Imperialism viewed as the highest stage of capitalism leads to war. But why? The explanation is in terms of the class-struggle, not in those of the struggle for existence.

⁸ Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 81.

As accumulation proceeds, the worker grows poorer in the absolute sense. His purchasing power therefore continually decreases. But productive power is constantly increasing. More and more goods are produced, which can be disposed of at a profit only in foreign markets, where capitalism is less developed. It may seem as if the search for markets is a purely economic enterprise, but political control or power makes commercial profits secure. Conquest creates spheres of influence; it gives the conqueror a privileged position in the conquered territory, even if trade rivals are allowed to compete. Trade follows the flag.

Lenin had his differences with Kautsky, and he goes for Kautsky in his characteristic manner. Kautsky had ventured to define imperialism as 'a product of highly developed industrial capitalism,' and to lay emphasis on the striving of industrial capitalists to 'annex increasingly big agrarian regions'. Kautsky's definition was not only wrong, said Lenin, but 'un-Marxian.' Kautsky's views ran counter to Marxism 'all along the line'. 'The characteristic feature of imperialism,' Lenin insists, 'is *not* industrial capital, *but* finance capital.'⁹ Puerile war of words! The characteristic feature of imperialism is neither industrial nor finance capital, but expansion determined by imperious economic necessity, which would remain even if both industrial and finance capital completely disappeared.

Let the State in England take over all capital, merchant as well as bank capital. Let the State take over all

⁹ See Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. V, or *New Data for Lenin's Imperialism*, by Varga and Mendelssohn, p. 198.

trusts, combinations, kartels and other industrial enterprises. Let the export of British capital cease. Britain, as a socialist State, we further assume, takes no part in the formation of capitalist monopolies which share the world among themselves, and, finally, Britain grants independence or *purna swaraj* to all her colonies and dependencies.

All the five stages of highly developed capitalism thus come to the end, so far as Britain is concerned. Will that put an end to the struggle for existence for the British people? It would become immeasurably bitterer than before. They could not pay for their daily food, not to speak of comforts and luxuries to which they are accustomed. Britain as a socialist State would be compelled to acquire more territory as her population increased, and even for the support of her existing numbers—unless the British people reconciled themselves to a much lower standard of living than that of the average Russian worker.

Suppose British communists seize power. Will they immediately set free their subjects in the Empire? Not unless they are saints, more interested in the goods of the other world than this.

We may imagine the whole world split up into a number of socialist States, their boundaries coinciding with the boundaries of the existing States. The rule of international monopoly capitalism may be ended, but the struggle for existence would continue. Socialist States would fight for markets and colonies as capitalist States do now.

Russia seeks no conquests abroad. She has no need to. But even Russia is not prepared to part with a single foot of her territory. In the *New Data for Lenin's Imperialism* the percentage of territories belonging to European

Colonial Powers in Asia is shown to have decreased from 56·6 per cent in 1900 to 20·6 per cent in 1932, the fall of 36 per cent being due to the rise of the U. S. S. R. But the Asiatic part of the U. S. S. R. is still a part of Russia as it was before, the only difference being that instead of the Tsar, Stalin is in the saddle. No important part of the U. S. S. R. will be permitted to break away from the U. S. S. R., irrespective of local national aspirations. Take the Russian Ukraine as an example. If Russia lost the Ukraine (not necessarily through annexation by Germany), her economic position would be weakened. The Ukrainians may develop national separatist sentiments, and a thorough dislike for Stalinist Marxism, but I can more easily think of Britain granting *purna swaraj* to India than Stalin to the Ukraine. I deserve to be hanged, drawn and quartered for saying that. But the late lamented Faizulla Khodjayeve and Gregori Fedorovich Grinko (both shot by Stalin), if they had lived, would have agreed with me.¹⁰

10 Gregori Fedorovich Grinko, who rose to be the People's Commissar for Finance of the U.S.S.R. confessed to being 'a Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist.' It seems a national Fascist organization existed in the Ukraine which resorted to "bogus slogans of national 'independence'" (see the Case of the Soviet Bloc of 'Rights and Trotskyites,' Moscow, 1938, pp. 718-19.)

Faizullah Khodjayeve (head of the Bokhara People's Republic in 1920) at his trial related his activities in connection with "the bourgeois-nationalist organization 'Milli-Ittikhad'" in Bokhara. The object of this organization was 'to transform the Bokhara People's Republic into a bourgeois democratic republic, as a buffer State between Britain and Soviet Russia' (Ibid. pp. 212-3). We may think of the Soviet Union as a happy union of independent republics, but the Soviet Union is an Empire in the same sense as the Empire of Britain. Possibly we in India can talk of and work for independence with less risk of being shot or hanged than the subject peoples of the Soviet Union. Naturally I become an ally of British Imperialism for saying so!

MARXISM IS DEAD

Still Russia is big, and she can build her socialism with her own resources, without casting covetous eyes on territories belonging to other Powers. What we are really concerned with is the smaller States, whose inhabitants want more living room. A change of economic system is not, in their case, the means of relieving economic pressure.

Viewed thus, there is a link connecting new imperialism with the old, or modern with ancient imperialism.

The forms of exploitation have changed, but the essence and fundamental causes of war and conquests, or imperialist expansion are still grounded in the struggle for existence.

ANCIENT IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is a very old thing. It existed long centuries before the rise of modern capitalism, and it had precisely the same meaning then as it has now—exploitation of subject peoples in the interest of the imperial country.

The States of ancient Greece were city States. But the city State of Athens was an Imperial State in the true sense of the word. The Athenian Empire was a continental as well as a maritime dominion. Athens was at the head of a Confederacy of city States. After peace had been concluded with Persia (448 B.C.) Athens turned the Confederacy into her Empire. The subject States paid tribute to Athens, though the tribute was not oppressive. The original object of levying the tribute was to provide a fund for the defence of Greece against Persia, but Athens utilized it for her own purposes, *e.g.*, to defray the cost of an Athenian campaign in Boetia and for adorn-

ing Athens with temples. Was this just, asked Thucydides, son of Melesias? No, but, says Bury, "Justice is never entirely compatible with the growth of a country to political greatness, and Pericles was resolved to make his country great at all hazards." His policy towards the allied cities, in his own words, was to "keep them well in hand." The suppression of the revolt in Euboea "showed in its undisguised shape the rule of might."¹¹

Dependent countries even in the twentieth century know what the "rule of might" means, and how turbulent people are "kept in hand."

Greek colonies were founded by "*lacklands*"¹². Adam Smith, writing before Malthus, emphasized the tendency towards over-population which produced these lacklands: "All the different States of ancient Greece possessed, each of them, but a very small territory, and when the people in any one of them multiplied beyond what that territory could easily maintain, a part of these were sent in quest of a new habitation in some remote and distant part of the world, the warlike neighbours, who surrounded them on all sides, rendering it difficult for any of them to enlarge very much its territory at home."¹³

The colonies founded by Rome were different in character from Greek colonies. While the latter were more or less independent, Roman colonies were of a politico-military nature—a garrison planted in a conquered province, under the control of the mother country. Roman colonies provided land for free men in Rome who

11 *History of Greece*, by J. B. Bury, pp. 364-5.

12 The family system tended to create landless men. "Such lacklands were ripe for colonial enterprise." Bury, *loc cit.*, pp. 86-7.

13 *The Wealth of Nations*, Book IV, Chapter VII.

were landless. A conquered country became the property of Rome ; in most cases one-third of the territory was reserved for State purposes (*ager publicus*). This included not only waste-land but also land which was already under cultivation.¹⁴

Adam Smith is careful to note the difference between Greek and Roman colonies. "But," he says, "though the Roman colonies were in many respects different from the Greek ones, the interest which prompted to establish them was equally plain and distinct. Both institutions derived their origin *from irresistible necessity, a clear and evident utility.*" The citizens who had no land "had scarce any other means of subsistence, but the bounties of the candidates at the annual elections." They clamoured for land and conquering Rome assigned them lands generally in the conquered provinces of Italy.

In the conquered provinces Rome levied troops for imperialist wars. There are also many instances of grosser forms of exploitation. Levy relates that a governor in the Iberian Peninsula (Spain) who, in a time of difficulty in war, had vowed games and a temple, made the Iberians provide the means of fulfilling his vow. Great quantities of corn were exported from Spain to Rome (203 B.C.). Gold and silver mines existed and were worked in Spain. Large quantities of both metals were brought by Governors to Rome. In the years 206-197 B.C. alone the bullion thus brought to Rome amounted to 130,000 lbs. of silver and 4,000 lbs. of gold.¹⁵

The predatory character of ancient Roman imperial-

14 *Handwoerterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, Vol. I, p. 50.

15 *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. VIII, .p. 310.

ism is still more fully revealed by the system of taxation. All Italian land, as a rule, was tax-free, while all provincial land, excepting that specially exempted, was subject to tax. The imperial revenues were raised chiefly from the provinces. "It was as if England were to defray the expenses of her own administration from the proceeds of a tax levied upon the Indian Empire."¹⁶ The farming of taxes made the system more galling and onerous.

We have seen that the fundamental cause of the expansion of ancient Greece and ancient Rome was economic necessity. The same fundamental cause of imperialist expansion is at work now—economic necessity resulting from the growth of numbers. Exploitation is characteristic of modern imperialism precisely in the same sense as it was characteristic of ancient imperialism. Imperial Britain does not defray the cost of her administration with revenues raised in India, but derives considerable profit in other forms. India is 'the brightest jewel in the British crown' in more than one sense. Further, all classes of the British people share in this benefit, some more and others less. The financial oligarchies take the lion's share but the British working man is not forgotten.

Lenin knows about ancient imperialism. But the Marxian outlook knows no struggle for existence, only class-war. Therefore, Lenin finds nothing in common between old and new imperialism. He says¹⁷ :—

"Colonial policy and imperialism existed before this latest stage of capitalism, and even before capitalism.

¹⁶ *Historians' History of the World*, Vol. V, p. 340.

¹⁷ Varga, loc. cit., p. 182.

Rome, founded on slavery, pursued a colonial policy and achieved imperialism. But 'general' arguments about imperialism, which ignore, or put into the background the fundamental difference of social-economic systems, inevitably degenerate into absolutely empty banalities, or into grandiloquent comparisons like : 'Greater Rome and Greater Britian.' Even the colonial policy of capitalism in its previous stages is essentially different from the colonial policy of finance capital."

Let us admit that modern imperialism is not only a policy but 'a whole system of capitalist economy.'¹⁸ Let us also admit that ancient imperialism was based on the exploitation of slaves. But finance capital exploits wage-labour, and, according to Marxism, the wage-labourer is little better than a slave. Why should the exploitation of 'wage-labour' cause a fundamental difference between ancient and modern imperialism? The Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist view of modern imperialism misses the substance and grasps the shadow; attention is fixed on the ways

18 A faithful commentator on the passage from Lenin quoted above says : (Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 325.)

"The imperialism of ancient Rome, which pursued a predatory policy of conquest and which subjected a number of countries in Europe, Asia and Africa to its rule by force of arms, must not be confused with modern imperialism any more than the usurers' capital which existed before the capitalist epoch must be confused with usurers' bank capital in the epoch of imperialism. The difference between the predatory policy of conquest of ancient Rome and the predatory policy of modern imperialism is that in ancient Rome it was the policy of the big landlords and of the merchant capitalists, whose rule was based on the exploitation of slaves, while under modern imperialism, it is the policy of finance capital, i.e., bank capital merged with industrial capital, the rule of which is based on the exploitation of wage labour. This, by the way, shows how wrong it is to define modern imperialism as a 'policy' only and not as a whole system of capitalist economy."

and means of exploitation (international combines, etc.), while the real cause of imperialist expansion, economic necessity due to the growth of numbers, is overlooked.

Across our North-West Frontier, capitalism does not exist in a highly developed form. It would be wrong to speak of finance capital dominating the tribal area or the countries lying further West. Now suppose the British army is withdrawn from India on the grant of *purna Swaraj*, leaving the *charkha* and 'soul-force' to defend India. If India has thoroughly imbibed the spirit of *satyagraha* as taught by Mahatma Gandhi, the fate of India, on winning *Swaraj*, may be easily predicted. We shall lose independence after winning it. A new Empire would arise in India, and it would be not our own. And this Empire would be created not by finance capital but starving men who would pour into non-resisting India from across the North-West border, as they have done before.

We in India know a little more about imperialism than the imperialist countries of Europe—we have been the victims of Imperialist aggression for a thousand years. The problem of winning and retaining independence is for us a practical problem—it is not a question of words and definitions. Knowing our past history, who can say that there will be no danger to Indian independence from across the North-West border? And the source of danger lies in the unceasing, unrelenting struggle for existence, not in industrial capital, nor in the merging of industrial and merchant capital with finance capital.

The Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist view of imperialism is wrong, because it confounds the gains of imperialism with the profits of finance capital. Imperialist loot

benefits all sections of the population.

Expansion relieves economic pressure, both directly and indirectly.

Directly economic pressure is relieved when colonies are used for settlement. But even when conquered territory is not suitable for actual colonization, it is a source of large indirect gain to the conquering country as a whole, not merely to finance capital or financial oligarchies.

We may study the causes of the present conflict among the nations. The Marxist interprets it in terms of capitalism. Hitler and Mussolini are agents of capitalism or lackeys of capital, and they are pursuing their expansionist policies at the bidding of their financial oligarchies! And the deluded Italian and German workers follow them—even when they know that a Greater Italy and a Greater Germany would mean nothing for them but increased misery and starvation!

If the present conflict is merely a war of financial oligarchies and no expression of the struggle for existence, then the part of Russia in the whole affair is difficult to understand.

One way of making the world safe for democracy for the next twenty or thirty years is for France, Britain and the United States letting Germany and Russia fight it out between themselves. In the event of a war between Germany and Russia, Japan would probably not remain neutral. Now the class-struggle has not ended in Russia, and if the Russian proletariat, or the lower-paid workers, are true Marxists, to whom the class-struggle is everything and their country nothing, the result of a war in which Germany attacked Russia from the West, and

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

Japan from the East, is a foregone conclusion. The whole Russian system would collapse, whatever its military strength on paper, and Russia would be dismembered.

The Soviet Union realises the dangers of isolation, and seeks to safeguard its position by means of alliances with France and Britain. The struggle for existence has driven Marxist (!) Russia into the arms of Western finance capital. This alliance has no meaning whatsoever in terms of imperialism regarded as the highest stage of capitalism. But its meaning in terms of the struggle for existence is plain to everybody.

GERMAN COLONIES

We are not concerned with the German demand for the restoration of former German colonies. This is a question which Germany will settle with Britain and France. But the German demand has led to a controversy which throws some light on the subject of this chapter.

It is an old demand, which has been repeated again and again during the past 18 years. The National Socialist German Workers' Party, led by Hitler, adopted a programme of 25 points at a great mass meeting held in Munich on February 25, 1920. Point 3 of the programme related to German colonies :—

"3. We demand land and territory (colonies) for the nourishment of our people and for settling our surplus population."¹⁹

19 *Hitler's Official Programme*, by Gottfried Feder (George Allen, London), p. 38.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Soon after his accession to power Hitler, in the course of an interview granted to a representative of the *Sunday Express* on February 11, 1933, said :

“So far as our overseas colonies are concerned, we have by no means abandoned our efforts for their restoration. This problem also must be justly solved. There are a great many things which Germany is compelled to import from foreign countries, and our need for colonies is just as great as that of any other Power.”²⁰

In another interview granted on October 18, 1933, to Mr. Ward Price, correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, the German Chancellor said that there were too many people living on German soil, and that it was in the interest of the world not to deprive a great nation of necessary means of existence. He added: “We hold the conviction that we are as fit to administer and organize colonies as any other people.”²¹

The total area of Germany (excluding Austria and Sudetenland) is 470,000 square kilometres. 70,000 square kilometres were lost on account of the Treaty of Versailles. Ten per cent of the total area represents water, wasteland and land built-over. Of the remaining 90 per cent, 27 per cent is covered with forests, which leaves 63 per cent as a possible source of food ; 46 per cent of this is cultivable land and 17 per cent pasture. “Land is a fixed quantity,” says Ziegelmayer, “and Germany’s living room is thus restricted, so restricted that its unre-

²⁰ *Kolomal Politisches Quellenheft*, by Dr. E. G. Jacob, 1935, Bamberg, p. 65.

²¹ *Ibid.* p. 16.

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

mitting exploitation is a self-evident duty,"²²

There is no doubt at all that pressure on agricultural resources is being severely felt in Germany. More land is wanted for settling second, third and fourth sons of peasants. Assuming that there is no change in the birth rate, it has been calculated that 380,000 new farms will be required for settling peasants before 1860. 34,000 farms were created between 1923 and 1930, which leaves 350,000 as the number of the required new farms.

At the beginning of 1933 there were available in Germany for this purpose about 5,000,000 acres. Taking the average size of a new farm to be about 25 acres, this area would suffice for 200,000 new settlers. If Germany is not able to acquire more land, by 1860 a situation would arise which would drive German peasants into the towns in search of livelihood.

"This makes the German situation distressingly clear," says Dr. Paul Hoevel. "All the given possibilities or our restricted land are being exploited. But the Germans can live as a nation with a future only if new land is found in the next few decades for the increase of population. If the European Powers had the same interest as Germany in enduring peace in Europe, their reason would suggest to them the opening of the way for Germans to settlement-colonies in overseas countries."²³

OPEN DOOR

It is hoped that the policy of 'open door' will solve the colonial question. This hope is not well-founded. In the first place the 'door' has shut so firmly that it will not

²² *Rohstofffragen der deutschen Volksernährung*, by Dr. W. Ziegelmayer (Leipzig, 1937), p. 316.

²³ *Grundfragen deutscher Wirtschaftspolitik*, by Dr. Paul Hoevel, Berlin, 1935, p. 111.

open again—or can be reopened only with the greatest difficulty. Secondly, the mother-country is always in a position of advantage in trading with its colonies, and thirdly, ‘open door’ does not solve valuta difficulties.

Would the abolition of colonial preferences equalize trading advantages of all countries?

A statistical examination of this problem has been carried out by the Statistical Institute of the University of Rome, under the guidance of Prof. Dr. Corrado Gini. The trade of about 60 pairs of colonies, possessions, mandated territories or dominions with their mother-countries was analysed. The territories were divided into three groups. The first group comprised pairs of colonies, etc., neither of which granted any preference to the mother-country; the second group comprised pairs one of which granted preferential treatment; and third, pairs both of which did so. For reasons of space I cannot go into details, and will only state the general conclusion of the enquiry as formulated by Dr. Gini in a lecture at Kiel University:

“We are therefore justified in concluding that statistical calculations, made accurately, indisputably prove the truth of the old saying ‘Trade follows the flag,’ and this is true even in the case of territories which grant no trade preference to the ruling country.”²⁴

Valuta means foreign exchange, or means of making payments abroad.

If trade were free, Germany could import food and

²⁴ *Kieler Vortraege* No. 49, published by Gustav Fischer, Jena, 1937. p. 17.

raw materials from overseas countries as easily as the colonial Powers. Why should Germany want colonies of her own?

The argument overlooks the fact that food and raw materials purchased from foreign countries have to be paid for in foreign currency, which is not easy to obtain.

"The German Reich wants raw materials," says Dr. Weigelt, "payable in Reichsmarks.

"Now our colonies [*i.e.*, old German colonies] are so important as a source of raw materials, that they could supply a considerable portion of raw materials which we at present buy with foreign currencies, and they will supply them in Reichsmarks, under our own rule" ²⁵

This is a very important consideration for Germany. Germany is a debtor country and, for the sake of solvency, she must not only not add to her financial obligations to the external world, but reduce them. Dr. Weigelt does not forget that in the outside world, of which Germany is a debtor, manufactured goods are made everywhere, and that foreign countries show increased unwillingness to buy German manufactures. If Germany employed her means of production and labour-power in developing the natural resources of her colonies, she could easily reduce her foreign indebtedness and build up a favourable trade-balance. "These points of view," says Dr. Weigelt, "are important, and must again and again be placed before those who maintain that it is a matter of indifference where and how one buys, since one may buy anywhere in the world." ²⁶

²⁵ *Beitraege Zur deutschen Kolonialfrage*, by D. Westermann, Berlin, 1937, p. 80. ²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 81.

The debtor position of Germany explains more than one riddle. Any free trader will tell you that autarchie is impossible, that it is madness. And yet Germany and Italy are zealously pursuing autarchic aims. Mussolini has very largely succeeded in freeing Italy from 'the slavery of foreign bread' (*schiavitù del pane straniero*). In an official Party Manifesto on the position of the National Socialist German Workers' Party, issued in Munich on March 6th, 1930, Hitler insisted that increased production of agriculture was 'a question of life and death for the German nation.'²⁷

Germany has to import a considerable portion of its food. Before the Great War Germany paid for these imports with her industrial exports, her trade and her deposits of capital abroad. But her defeat in the Great War and the infamous Peace Treaty put an end to this possibility.

"Today," stated the Manifesto, "we are paying for our imports of food with the help of foreign loans." That gave foreign financiers a terrible grip on the whole economic and political life of Germany. By threatening to cut off their credits and therefore the imports of food, *i.e.*, 'by hanging the bread-bin out of reach', they could reduce German workers to the position of virtual slaves. Autarchie offered a way of escape from this thralldom, and Germany took it.

It is obvious that the acquisition of overseas-colonies would enormously strengthen the economic position of Germany, and may render her altogether independent of foreign credits. It is an impossible position for a country,

²⁷ *Hitler's Official Programme*, p. 30.

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

whose industrial exports tend to dwindle on account of causes beyond its control, to continue to rely on imported food and raw materials, paid for by means of foreign credits. This is the way to ultimate bankruptcy and ruin.

What is the British reaction to the German demand? The British view is succinctly stated in a tract entitled *The British Colonial Empire and the German Claim*, issued by the Empire Economic Union. The Empire Economic Union was founded by the late Lord Melchett in 1929.

The position of the Empire Economic Union is that the German surrender of colonies was absolute, and that the colonies were surrendered not to the League of Nations but the victors, or the Allies. The League of Nations is not concerned in the matter at all. The Allies divided the colonies among themselves 'substantially in accordance with what each had conquered.'²⁸ But to satisfy President Wilson, it was declared that the Allies took the colonies not for the purpose of selfish exploitation, but in the interests of the native populations 'and with some regard for the interests of the world as a whole.'

The idea is altogether wrong that these territories belong to the League of Nations and that they are held by the mandatory powers 'subject to good behaviour on a kind of tenancy.'²⁹ "Germany's surrender was outright. The division amongst the Allies was also outright and intended to be permanent."³⁰ The annexation of German colonies by the Allies therefore rests, clearly and absolutely, on the right of conquest, or on force.

²⁸ *The British Colonial Empire and the German Claim*, London, 1937, 21.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 21.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 21.

The Empire Economic Union has framed an authoritative definition of a 'mandate': "A mandate is not the grant of a territory; it is an obligation undertaken with regard to a territory which you already have."³¹ The Allies conquered German colonies which now belonged to them, and they undertook certain obligations regarding them. Similarly Germany can hold a mandate 'if in some way or another Germany should acquire a colonial territory.' Or she may take a mandate for some of the territory now in her possession, *e.g.*, Berlin: "There is no reason why Germany should not have a mandate for Berlin, if she wants to, and is prepared to govern Berlin on League of Nations principles."³² A good joke—a very good joke. Hitler may now ask the League to grant him a mandate for Czechoslovakia!

The right of conquest is openly asserted by the Empire Economic Union. It is 'the real question.' Another 'real question' is that of 'the whole defence of the British Empire.'

Is it conceivable that Britain can take the risk of putting Germany with submarine bases, with a powerful air-force and with German-trained African forces in Tanganyika 'directly athwart the line of communications which now exist between British territories from North to South Africa, as well as on the flank of all our sea-routes in the Indian ocean?'³³ It is a grave risk. The security of the whole of the British Empire is involved. The cession

³¹ *The British Colonial Empire and the German Claim*, London, 1937, pp. 22-23.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

of Tanganyika would destroy the homogeneity of the British Empire in Africa, apart from endangering the sea communications. From the strategic point of view, therefore, 'these territories are vital to the British Empire.'³⁴

The Allies, it appears, took over German colonies 'primarily' for reasons of 'security.' "This security obtained by the Allies did not involve any loss of security to the German homeland."³⁵

The Germans are a very unreasonable people. They should have parted with their colonies cheerfully. But they grumbled. And now they want the colonies back!

The Empire Economic Union would fight for Tanganyika and S. W. Africa since these territories are of vital importance to the British Empire. Not so, Sir Norman Angell. He says:

"The situation calls for sacrifices, but they are not the imaginary ones of giving up imperial territory, which, so far as we are directly concerned, would prove no sacrifice at all."³⁶

Sir Norman Angell is not worried about the security of the British Empire, but the welfare of the native races.

The main thesis of Sir Norman Angell is that the possession of territory is relatively unimportant. There are no 'haves' and no 'have-nots.' Do the 'haves' possess what they 'have'? No. The 'haves' really have nothing, and the 'have-nots' lack nothing. You will

³⁴ *The British Colonial Empire and the German Claim*, London, 1937. p. 7. Foreword by Brigadier-General Sir Henry Page-Croft.

³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 20.

³⁶ *This Have and Have-Not Business*, by Sir Norman Angell, London, 1936, p. 20.

perhaps say that within their vast Empire the British enjoy possibilities of expansion which are denied to overcrowded countries with a restricted area, like Germany, Italy and Japan. This is a mistake. Britain has no control over the immigration restrictions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa—not more than she has control over the immigration restrictions of the United States. Britain does not ‘possess’ the Dominions. They are their own masters under the Statute of Westminster, and they exercise the right of exclusion ‘with very great severity.’

In the matter of tariffs, again, the Dominions enjoy perfect liberty. The Dominions impose tariffs on British manufactures which are in many cases much steeper, much more injurious to British trade than the tariffs of many a foreign State like Denmark or Argentina. “India,” says Sir Norman Angell, “has now won a similar fiscal independence.”³⁷

Sir Norman Angell forgets that India is not a Dominion, and that she has not won any fiscal independence. The Government of India Act of 1935 imposes a special responsibility on the Governor-General to prevent penal discrimination against British imports.

Does Britain ‘possess’ India? Sir Norman Angell would say ‘No.’ The political relationship between India and Britain confers no economic benefits upon Britain. Britain would lose nothing if India ceased to be a part of the British Empire!

Sir Norman Angell, good soul, has no conception of the extent of our wickedness. We want a lower rate of

³⁷ *This Have and Have-Not Business*, by Sir Norman Angell, London, 1936, p. 78.

exchange, and, when *swaraj* comes, we shall not import a single yard of British cloth—at any rate that is what our leaders said sometime ago (which explains the safeguards for British trade in the new constitution). And if (God forbid) socialists came to power in India, they would seize all British capital in India without compensation and repudiate all foreign debts !

Not many people would say with Sir Norman that the 'haves' do not possess what they have.

The economic advantages of colonies are thus explained by Ashton³⁸ :—

"Great Britain's colonies, as separate from the Dominions, are—almost each one—powerful factors in the lives of every man, woman and child in the British Isles.

"Remove the colonies, and this is what you would remove at the same time at least :—

"(a) The ships that ply between Great Britain and colonial ports. Thus you would affect the livelihoods of (i) British seamen, (ii) British shipyard workers, (iii) British workers in steel mills who produce the steel which goes to build the ships, (iv) British miners who produce the coal to fire the ships, (v) British clerks who serve in the shipping offices, (vi) British dockworkers and other quayside employees who assist in the loading and discharge of ships ;

"(b) the employment of British labour in at least the following categories: (i) the manufacture of steel products needed for colonial engineering enterprise—bridges, railways, locomotives, steamers for use on

³⁸ *Glamour for Colonies*, by H. S. Ashton, London, 1936, pp. 112-13.

colonial rivers and lakes, cranes and boilers ; (ii) the production of electrical equipment for use in every conceivable capacity, from wireless installations and dynamos to the humblest electric bulb ;

“(c) employment in the warehousing and distributive trades concerned with the distribution of colonial produce, an important item, since it covers (i) warehousing, (ii) marketing, (iii) packing, (iv) re-shipping to foreign buyers, (v) not infrequently blending and or refining, all of which give employment to an untold number of persons in Great Britain ;

“(d) the profit on all this intense activity, all of which is assessable to taxation and adds to the spending power of the people of Great Britain and thus helps to reduce the burden in other directions.”

It will be seen that the question is not merely that of profits of finance capital, but of employment for British workers.

It should also be clear that imperialism is not merely power-politics, and profit-politics, but bread-politics as well. Bread for British workers means their present standard of living.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The results of our study may be summarised in the form of propositions which have a direct bearing on 'Indian Socialism.'

1. Marxism is socialism of the industrial proletariat. It has little application to India; we have no industrial proletariat worth speaking of. Such proletariat as we possess is of little use for winning independence. It is absolutely and utterly inconceivable that our industrial proletariat, forming about 1 per cent of the population, will rout British imperialism, and establish its dictatorship. It is perfectly ridiculous to talk of Marxism in India in this sense.

2. We have as little use for Marxism as a 'method.' The form of future society cannot be deduced from dialectical principles. Negation of the negation has no precise meaning in social relations. All history is not a history of class-struggles.

3. Speculation regarding the future form of society must take account of the struggle for existence among organized groups of peoples with antagonistic interests.

4. Socialism is a demand for social justice and planned development of the productive resources of a country. Our socialism must be national, that is, we must keep in view our own peculiar conditions, both economic and political, in building our socialist economy.

5. India must use the driving force of nationalism, based on class-unity, both for winning independence and maintaining it.

Class-unity, nationalism, a strong and powerful State which will never wither away are the very antithesis of Marxism. 'Indian socialism' totally rejects Marxism.

India will have to evolve her own plan and methods for solving her problems. No ready-made system exists which India may adopt.

The world is indebted to Russia for a great experiment. Russia has demonstrated the futility of Marxism. Only those who have no regard for truth can maintain that socialism in Russia has created a class-less society or a State which will 'wither away.' Marxism is dead.

We cannot follow Russia. India is a predominantly agricultural country like Russia, but there is nothing else in common. Our chief problem is that of extreme pressure of the population on land. In Russia there was enough land to form collective farms, and to give to each farmer a small plot as individual property. In India if all the cultivated land were divided equally among agricultural workers, each worker would be provided with a tiny holding of 2 or 3 acres, and there would be no land left for collective farming!

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that State planning in Russia has been an unqualified success, it does not follow that it will be a similar success under Indian conditions. I cannot think of more effective or more speedy means of ruining Indian industries than exclusive State ownership and State management. In a country where caste domination prevails, where appointments are made on grounds which, as a rule, have nothing to do with efficiency or merit, where corruption is rife almost everywhere, State ownership and manage-

CONCLUSIONS

ment may be trusted to produce chaos, poverty and misery.

We cannot assume that a change of economy will immediately transform Indian character and outlook, which are products of long centuries of foreign rule.

A State directly and actively participating in business may meet our needs. It will eliminate the evils associated with unbridled capitalism, ensure social justice, and make planning possible. The system proposed is not free from defects. But State capitalism may be worse. For us it is a choice of evils.

The form of our future economy cannot be determined by dialectical or *a priori* reasoning. There is no ideal economy as such. The ideal economy is that which works best under given conditions. Nor can the political factor be ignored. Possibly an ideal state of affairs would be dictatorship of the proletariat with nationalization of land and capital. But the necessity to win *swaraj* changes the ideal itself. The struggle for *swaraj* demands class-unity; the co-operation of different interests for this struggle cannot be obtained except through a policy of compromise.

By a compromise I do not mean a communist 'united front.'¹ The 'united front' tactics of communists are thoroughly dishonest. These tactics are so well known now that they will not deceive any one.² There can be no

1 The 'United Front' tactics comprise four steps none of which can be skipped. "The first is 'the United Front,' the second strikes and disorders, the third civil war, and the fourth Soviet Government." See *Revolutionary Socialism*, by Arnold Lunn, issued by the Right Book Club, Chapter VII.

2 The Communist is ready to make compromises, but not at the sacrifice of loyalty to communism. He would support a class-

'united front' between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie when the proletariat is all the time secretly plotting to cut the throats of the bourgeoisie. India needs an honest understanding between different interests for winning *swaraj*. The ideal must therefore be so framed as to make an appeal to all. Our socialism must be socialism for all—it cannot be class-socialism, leading to class dictatorship.

There is no class of the community which does not stand to gain by *swaraj*. *Swaraj* means freedom from the heavy annual burden of foreign obligations: it means a protective tariff such as the best interests of our industries require; it means the development of ship-building, exchange-banking, machine construction and rapid industrialization of the country; it means a rate of

enemy but only as a rope supports the hanged. Lenin says (*Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Selected Works, Vol. X, pp. 130-31*):—

"Very often the British communists find it hard to approach the masses at the present time and even to get them to listen to them. If I as a Communist come out and call upon the workers to vote for Henderson against Lloyd George, they will certainly listen to me. And I will be able to explain in a popular manner not only why Soviets are better than Parliament and why the dictatorship of the proletariat is better than the dictatorship of Churchill (which is concealed behind the signboard of bourgeois 'democracy'), but also that I wanted to support Henderson with my vote in the same way as a rope supports the hanged—that the impending establishment of a Henderson government will prove that I am right, will bring the masses over to my side, and will accelerate the political death of the Hendersons and the Snowdens as was the case with their friends in Russia and Germany."

What is the value of a compromise made in this spirit? Lenin tries to meet the objection: "These tactics are too 'subtle,' or too complicated." They are neither 'subtle' nor 'complicated,' but downright dishonest. Fenner Brockway expresses his 'distrust of the honesty of communists; they have made for themselves a reputation for double-dealing and disloyalty and stabbing-in-the-back which it will take much to live down' (*Workers' Front, p. 196*).

CONCLUSIONS

exchange which will increase our power of international competition; finally it means an economy which would guarantee to the peasant remunerative prices for his produce. When so much depends on *swaraj* only Marxists who are totally ignorant of Indian facts and problems will imperil *swaraj* by inflaming class-passions—the easiest thing to do where there is so much poverty and suffering as in our country.

Nothing depends on getting rid of landlords and capitalists. Even if all landlords disappeared or 'withered away' like the Marxist State, the Indian peasant would remain practically as poor as he is today. The abolition of landlordism would not relieve the growing pressure of population on the land. Cutting the throats of all money-lenders would not make agriculture more remunerative. The State may take possession of all factories, but these factories have to be worked. What India needs is a better economy, and there is no reason why everyone, whether proletarian or bourgeois, who is prepared to work for himself and his country, should not find a place in the new economy. It will need all and it cannot come into existence without the co-operation of all.

If it is still argued that the bourgeois is an ally of foreign imperialism and a sworn enemy of the proletariat who must be annihilated, then all that can be said is that there will never be any change for the better for us. India must choose between class-war and freedom. In a dependent country class-war is a road leading not to independence and prosperity but to eternal bondage and poverty.

We may learn from recent history. What did China

gain by civil war? What have been the fruits of civil war in Spain?

Civil war was deliberately started in China by the agents of Russia. Chinese students were trained as revolutionaries in Moscow, and Russia supplied not only agitators, but Red organizers of revolt and Red army commanders. China is an agrarian country, with a dense population like our own. There is landlordism in certain parts of the country, but, as in India, the abolition of landlordism is no solution of the difficulties of the Chinese peasant.³ The seeds of class-war were still deliberately sown, and very quickly the whole country was plunged into chaos. The result was inevitable. Having exhausted herself in civil war, China fell an easy

3 Sir Eric Teichman, of His Britannic Majesty's Consular Service in China (retired) says in *Affairs of China* (Methuen, 1938). pp. 211-12:—

"China is an agricultural country; and agrarian reforms, the dispossession of the landlords and the redistribution of the land, necessarily play a large part in the domestic programme of the communists. It is true that in certain provinces and areas the landlord system has grown into abuse, with a class of educated 'gentry' living on the labours of the peasantry, so that offers of land to the landless Chinese peasant must be a potent inducement to become a communist. But the majority of China's millions spend their day, toiling on their own land to get enough to eat. For there are too many Chinese and insufficient land to distribute. When the redistribution of the land has been accomplished, China's fundamental malady will still remain—over-population and the constant pressure of the surplus people on the means of subsistence available for their support. Communism may appeal as making a reality of revolution and as something new in a land where misgovernment is becoming chronic. But communistic teachings contain no panacea that will cure the economic ills of China or change the character of the Chinese race."

CONCLUSIONS

prey to the foreign invader. ⁴ When it was too late, com-

4 Mr. M. N. Roy says (*My Experiences in China*, pp. 4-5) :—

“On the other hand, exhausted in the prolonged struggle for suppressing the revolution, the Nationalist Government was powerless to put up any effective resistance against the military aggression of Japanese Imperialism which today threatens to end in the complete conquest of China.”

Mr. Roy finds that China ‘is much too backward for a Socialist revolution.’ Could not this discovery have been made earlier? Mr. Roy says in conclusion, pp. 95-96 :—

“While admiring their zeal, heroism and remarkable military exploits, it must be said that these eight years’ activities of the Chinese communists did more harm than good to China. Unification of the country under a centralized democratic State is the primary condition for a successful resistance to imperialist aggression in China. Its own reactionary social orientation prevented the Nationalist Government of Nanking from accomplishing that task. But the civil war also contributed considerably to that misfortune of the Chinese people. China is not yet ready for a proletarian revolution; the Soviet form of government is not suitable to the existing conditions. That should have been clear to the communists long ago. In that case, the tragedy of the last eight years would have been avoided.”

While Japan was threatening Chinese independence, the communists were engaged in a dialectical argument with the Kuomintang. Edgar Snow says in *Red Star Over China*, pp. 444-45 :—

“In this situation the communists argued that the Kuomintang’s attacks on the Soviets prevented the Chinese people from fulfilling their mission of ‘national liberation’ in driving out the Japanese, and that the Kuomintang’s own unwillingness to defend the country proved the bankruptcy of bourgeois leadership. The communist thesis of the revolution was thus validated. But the enraged Kuomintang retorted that the communists’ attempts to overthrow the Government prevented them from resisting Japan, while the ‘continued practice of ‘Red-banditry’ in the interior, despite the grave national crisis, retarded the realization of internal reforms. The interesting—and again dialectical—thing about these two positions is that both were right and both were wrong.”

How very interesting! And the result, the conquest of China and the end of communism is also ‘dialectical!’

MARXISM IS DEAD

munists started talking of class-unity! ⁵ Russia started the conflagration, and then stood aloof—she had her own interests to safeguard! ⁶ Class-war and communism are mainly responsible for the humiliation of China.

The lesson of the Spanish war is the same. Russia

5 *Red Star Over China*, by Edgar Snow, p. 445 :—

“What is the chief significance of this decade of political experience? Theoretically it is clearly this: that the communists have been forced to abandon temporarily their thesis that ‘only under the hegemony of the proletariat’ can the bourgeois democratic movement develop. Today it is acknowledged that only ‘a union of all classes’ can achieve those purposes. . . .

“The immediate struggle for power has ceased. Today communist slogans are: to support the central Government to hasten peaceful unification under Nanking, to realize bourgeois democracy, and to organize the whole nation to oppose Japan.”

The regrettable thing is that sense dawns on communists when it is too late—first the class-struggle, ruination and slavery, and then class-unity! And even then the communist abandons his ‘thesis’ only ‘temporarily’!

6 Edgar Snow (loc. cit. p. 443) says :—

“But while the imperialist powers were the objective allies of Nanking against communism, the assistance expected from the world proletariat failed to materialize. Although in the *Communist International Programme* it is clearly recognized that successful proletarian movements in semi-colonial countries such as China ‘will be possible only if direct support is obtained from the countries in which the proletarian dictatorship is established’ (i.e. in the U. S. S. R.), the Soviet Union, in fact, did not extend to the Chinese comrades the promised ‘assistance and support of the proletarian dictatorship’ in any degree commensurate with the need. On the contrary, the great help, amounting to intervention, which the Soviet Union gave to Chiang Kai-Shek until 1927 had the objective influence of bringing into power the most reactionary elements of the Kuomintang. Of course, the rendering of direct aid to the Chinese communists after 1927 became quite incompatible with the position adopted by the U. S. S. R.—for to do so would have been to jeopardize by the danger of international war the whole programme of Socialist construction in one country. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the influence of this factor on the Chinese revolution was very great.”

CONCLUSIONS

began the mischief.⁷ Long before Germany or Italy intervened in Spanish affairs, Moscow-trained revolutionaries and Russian agents were organizing an armed revolt against the Spanish Government. Spanish socialists had so thoroughly imbibed the spirit of the class-struggle, that even when General Franco was capturing town after town, there was 'war within war' in Republican Spain.⁸ Of

7 William Foss and Cecil Gerahty say in the *Spanish Arena* (Right Book Club, p. 95) :—

"We accuse the Soviet Government and those who assisted their plans of being the premeditated instigators of every major misfortune which had occurred in Spain since 1925. All the trouble in Spain which brought in the Republic, which existed all through the time of the Republic and finally culminated in the present civil war was the direct result of a calculated, relentless policy by the Soviet Government of Russia.

"Lenin, at the Second World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow in 1920, made his famous declaration that the 'second successful Proletarian Revolution' would take place in Spain, brought about by an armed proletariat. On Lenin's death Spain became a 'pious legacy' to the Kremlin. It was the duty of the communist chiefs to implement the sacred words of the great leader."

8 The war between Stalinist-Marxists and the Workers Party of Marxist Unity (P.O.U.M.) continued throughout the period of the civil war. Fenner Brockway says in *Workers' Front* (pp. 103-4) :—

"The greatest obstacle to the Russian policy was the P.O.U.M. It was revolutionary, and it had no delusions about Soviet Russia. Although small in numerical strength compared with the C.N.T., it had a clearer conception of what to do and its leadership was not restricted by Anarchist doubts about the use of the State. It was Marxist not only in theory but in practice. It was also disconcertingly open in its criticism of the Soviet bureaucracy in Russia; it was not prepared to pay the price of silence for the assistance offered by Russia to Spain. About the Moscow trials, for example, it was vigorously sceptical. It declined to believe that Trotsky and the revolutionary colleagues of Lenin had become agents of German Fascism. The fact that the leaders of the P.O.U.M., Andres Nin and Joaquin Maurin, had been in Moscow and had broken with the Russian leadership, intensified the antagonism.

course to the good Marxist the class-struggle is everything and the country nothing. The Spanish communists richly deserved the fate that has overtaken them.

India must make her choice between the two ideologies, of the class-struggle and of the struggle for existence. The class-struggle aims at the destruction of the bourgeoisie at whatever cost ; in the end it is supposed to create a State which ' withers away.' Recognition of the struggle for existence compels us to achieve class-unity at all costs for winning freedom, and having won it, for maintaining independence by means of a strong, all-powerful State which will never ' wither away.'

"It was this last fact, and the P.O.U.M. criticism of the Moscow trials, which gave the Communist International its line. It would denounce the P.O.U.M. in the same manner that it had denounced the Russian critics of Stalin. The P.O.U.M. leaders were also ' Trotskyists ' ! They were also agents of Fascism ! It mattered not that Trotsky had repudiated the P.O.U.M., or that hundreds of P.O.U.M. members had died fighting the Fascists. Henceforth they were Trotskyist-Fascists.

"The campaign of abuse and slander which the Communist International and the Communist Party began against the P.O.U.M. was almost incredible. The P.O.U.M. was denounced as the ' Fifth Column ' of General Franco—that is, as a military arm of the Fascists, serving their purposes in Madrid, Valencia and Barcelona whilst pretending to be their enemies. It was alleged to be a spy organization of General Franco. The P.O.U.M. regiments at the front, despite their courage against the Fascists, were held up to contumely as deliberately treacherous, retreating or refusing to advance on critical occasions in order to give the Fascists the victory. The P.O.U.M. was charged with being involved in a plot to assassinate Largo Caballero, the Socialist Prime Minister, Azana, the President, and La Passonaria, the popular woman communist leader.

"Not a jot or tittle of evidence was forthcoming to support these charges, but they were broadcast throughout Spain and the world through the literature of the Spanish Communist Party and the Communist International."

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS

I hope this little book will attract the attention of Marxists, and provoke criticism. But I may also be permitted to express the hope that the criticism will be free from slander and vilification.

In this respect Marx, Engels and Lenin set a bad example. Malthus, to whom Marshall gives 'a place among the founders of historical economics' is referred to by Marx as 'a master in plagiarism,' as 'a servitor of the ruling class' or 'servant (*Knecht*) of the bourgeoisie.' This is the communist's attempt to discredit his opponent. Mud is thrown recklessly in the hope that some of it will stick. The opponent's motives are questioned, his honesty is doubted, and he is roundly abused. And the vocabulary of abuse that the communist employs is almost limitless.

Lenin calls the leaders of the British labour movement of his time 'social traitors' and 'scoundrels.' Kautsky was 'a first-class hypocrite,' even a 'prostitute' (*Maedchen fuer alle*; *Maedchen fuer alles* in German is a maid-of-all-work, a good girl, who is turned into a prostitute by dropping the *s* of *alles*).

At his trial Bukharin was described by the public prosecutor Vyshinsky as 'this hardened political swindler;' 'this hypocritical, false, wily creature, this piously rapacious and respectfully malicious person;' 'a true watch-dog of fascism;' 'that damnable cross of a fox and a swine;' 'the acme of monstrous hypocrisy, perfidy, jesuitry and inhuman villainy.'

MARXISM IS DEAD

Even the execution of the former leaders of communism and the Soviet Union has not stemmed the torrent of abuse. In the official *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* they are called 'fiends,' 'insects,' 'dregs of humanity' and 'contemptible lackeys of the fascists.'

These may be legitimate methods of conducting an argument in the Soviet Union, but is it necessary for Indian Marxists to copy them?

The questions given below are meant to assist scientific critics. They are of fundamental importance in the study of Marxism. Straightforward, categorical answers will please me. And if I were a Marxist setting out to demolish an anti-Marxist, I would begin with the socialist-imperialist alliance (Questions 94-102). For once it has been found possible to interpret this alliance in terms of the class-struggle and the world revolution, the rest would be comparatively easy.

THE LABOUR THEORY

Q. 1. Is the following a correct statement of Marx's labour theory?

If:

20 yards of linen = 1 coat ;

20 yards of linen = 1 coat, or = 10 lbs. of tea, or
= 1 qr. of wheat, or = 2 oz. of gold, or = etc.;

1 coat, or 10 lbs. of tea etc. = 20 yards of linen ;

20 yards of linen, or 1 coat, etc. = 2 oz. of gold ;

something, that is labour, is common to the articles exchanged, or labour is the basis of value.

The value of a commodity varies directly as the quantity and inversely as the productiveness of the labour incorporated in it.

The greater the productiveness of labour, the less is the labour-time required for the production of an article.

Value depends on the amount of labour socially necessary, or the labour-time socially necessary for the production of an article.

The product of one hour of the labour of hand-loom weavers fell to one-half of its former value after the invention of machinery because, after the change, it represented only half an hour's social labour.

Supply and demand must tend to equilibrate each other, and when they do so, the market prices of commodities correspond with their natural prices, or coincide with their values. The market price of an article in such a case expresses the average amount of social labour necessary, under the average conditions of production, to supply the market with a certain mass of a certain article.¹

Misdirected labour creates no value because it was socially unnecessary labour. "Moreover, the phrase 'misdirected labour' does not cover alone such activities as digging holes in the ground and filling them up again. It covers cases of producing more of a useful commodity than society needs. If the world needs 100 million bushels of wheat and its farmers produce 150 million bushels, some of their labour was not socially necessary and it did not, therefore, create value" (John Strachey, or England's Marxist No. 1, in the *Nature of the Capitalist Crisis*, pp. 167-68).

If this statement of the labour theory is accepted as correct, the following questions may be answered:—

Q. 2. Is there any difference between socially necessary and socially useful labour?

¹ *Value, Price and Profit*, by Karl Marx, National Labour Press, London, pp. 26-27.

Q. 3. Are we permitted to say that the digger of a socially unnecessary hole does not create value because his labour was not socially useful ?

Q. 4. Are we permitted to say that the value of the product of one hour's labour of hand-loom weavers falls to one-half after the invention of machinery because its utility to society is reduced in the same proportion ?

Q. 5. Are we permitted to say that when there is over-production of wheat, the price of wheat falls and farmers lose heavily because some of their labour was not socially necessary or useful, or possessed no utility ?

Q. 6. Is this an explanation of value in terms of labour or utility ?

Q. 7. Labour is a factor governing value on the side of supply. Usefulness of labour, or utility is a factor governing value on the side of demand. Did Marx explain value in terms of the supply factor or the demand factor, or both ?

Q. 8. Suppose there are no hand-spinners and hand-weavers and social labour-time necessary to produce cloth by machinery is one-half of that required by hand-workers. Would the price of cloth fall to one-half if the quantity of mill-made cloth was just equal to that produced by hand-workers before ?

Q. 9. Is it possible for the value of the product of hand-weavers to fall to one-half unless the total supply of cloth, both mill-made and hand-made, is greater than before ?

Q. 10. Is it clear that when the total supply of cloth increases its marginal utility must fall, demand remaining the same ?

Q. 11. What is the test of socially necessary or unnecessary labour ? Is or is not labour socially necessary

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS

or unnecessary according as its products are or are not required by society ?

Q. 12. Would it not follow then that, not labour, but utility of the products of labour determines the exchange value of commodities at any given time ?

Q. 13. The price of an acre of cultivated land is, let us say, Rs. 100, and this is also the price of a good bicycle. A bicycle = an acre of land. Land was not produced by labour, but a bicycle incorporates a certain amount of socially necessary labour-time. What is common to both except utility ?

Q. 14. Today the labour-power of an average graduate of an Indian University commands about half the value it did thirty years ago. Why ? Socially necessary labour which a graduate incorporates today is greater than before, in any case not less.

IRON LAW OF WAGES

Q. 15. Marx says in *Wage, Labour and Capital* (p. 27) :—

“Thus, the cost of production of simple labour-power amounts to the *cost of the existence and propagation of the worker*. The price of this cost of existence and propagation constitutes wages. The wages thus determined are called the *minimum of wages*. This minimum wage, like the determination of the price of commodities in general by cost of production, does not hold good for the *single individual*, but *only for the race*. Individual workers, indeed, millions of workers, do not receive enough to be able to exist and to propagate themselves ; but the wages of the whole working class adjust themselves, within the limits of their fluctuations,

to this minimum." (Chapter IV).

This was generally true of British workers about a hundred years ago. Is it true today?

Q. 16. Do wages rise with the productivity of labour? If so, was Marx right or wrong in saying that the wages of the whole working class adjusted themselves to a minimum equal to the subsistence of the worker?

THEORY OF EXPLOITATION

Q. 17. Does not Marx use the existence minimum to determine the degree of exploitation of labour?

Q. 18. If wages are not determined by this existence minimum, does not the calculation of surplus value appropriated by the employer become more or less imaginary?

Q. 19. Since surplus value is created by human labour, does it not follow that (degree of exploitation remaining the same) the larger the number of labourers employed, the larger is the surplus value appropriated, and the higher is the rate of profit?

Q. 20. In the examples given by Marx to explain the formation of an average rate of profit (*Capital*, Vol. III, Chapter IX), it is shown that spheres of production with a lower organic composition of capital do yield a higher rate of profit. What is the proof?

Q. 21. When the different rates of profit are equalized to form an average rate of profit, goods of certain spheres of production are sold below and of others above their 'value.' What is the proof? And what is Marx's precise meaning?

Q. 22. In his example on p. 178 (*Capital*, Vol. III, Kerr ed.), Marx, assuming the degree of exploitation of

labour to be 25 per cent in the Asiatic country and 100 per cent in the European country, finds that the rate of profit in the Asiatic country is higher by more than 25 per cent than in the European country. Considering the higher degree of exploitation of labour in India 60 years ago, our rate of profit should have been four or five times higher. Was that so? Or had British and Indian capitalists formed a communist brotherhood?

Q. 23. Marx says: "Those branches of production which constitute national monopolies are exempted from this equalization process even if their rate of profit is higher than the social rate."² Marx is referring to agriculture.

Since the organic composition of agricultural capital is lower than that of industrial capital, and since agriculture is exempted from the equalization process, would it not follow that agriculture should show a higher rate of profit than industries?

Q. 24. Is this conclusion confirmed by facts?

Q. 25. What shall we say about a theory which collapses like a house of cards as soon as the slightest touch of facts is applied?

CLASS-WAR

Q. 26. The whole argument for class-war is founded on the opposition between the proletariat and wealth. There is negation of the negation because, with the accumulation of capital, the working class is impoverished in the absolute sense. "The worker is impoverished *absolutely*," Lenin says. Is the theory of the two poles confirmed by facts?

² *Marx-Engels Correspondence*, p. 244.

MARXISM IS DEAD

Q. 27. Was it not because of absolute impoverishment of the working class, of the 'complete' divorce of the working class from property, that Marx and Engels expected that the social revolution would first happen in England?

Q. 28. Where is the social revolution in England?

Q. 29. The social revolution first happened in Russia where the proletariat was very small numerically. "We want dictatorship of the proletariat. But where is the proletariat?" asked Lenin after the revolution. The New Economic Policy was to create the industrial proletariat—the revolution came first, and the proletariat next. What shall we say about a dialectical materialism which fails to produce revolutions where, according to the accepted canons of dialectic, the conditions are most ripe for a revolution? Is not the suspicion created that such dialectical materialism is pure bunkum?

Q. 30. Did Marx and Engels advocate a change from capitalism to communism on moral or ethical grounds or did they regard the transformation of capitalism into communism as 'inevitable' in consequence of the operation of a Natural Law?

Q. 31. What becomes of this 'inevitability' if the very conditions which should hasten this transformation (i.e., the accumulation of capital) prevent it?

THE STATE

Q. 32. Did Marx and Engels idealize the State like Fascists or regard it as an evil like anarchists?

Q. 33. It is agreed that the State does not disappear overnight. It 'withers away.' Is that an essential or vital difference between communism and anarchism?

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS

Is not the State equally an abomination to both ?

Q. 34. What did Marx understand by anarchy ? If he understood anarchy to mean the disappearance of the power of the State as soon as classes were abolished, what is the essential or vital difference between Marxism and Anarchism ?

NON-VIOLENCE

Q. 35. "We are not utopians," Lenin protests again and again. But he believed that when socialism developed into communism the need for violence against the people in general would vanish. Is this 'scientific' or utopian socialism ?

Q. 36. Lenin thought that with the abolition of exploitation, want and poverty, excesses will 'inevitably' begin to wither away. Is this 'scientific' or utopian socialism ?

Q. 37. Will the abolition of exploitation, want and poverty equalise incomes and wealth ?

Q. 37 (a). If inequality remains, will not the State 'inevitably' remain also as the guardian of inequality ?

Q. 38. Is the conception of a society in which every one works according to his capacity and consumes according to his needs 'scientific' or utopian ?

Q. 39. Is it possible to produce all necessities, comforts and luxuries in such abundance as to introduce consumption according to needs ?

Q. 40. Is it not certain that when consumption is according to needs, the productivity of labour will fall off ?

Q. 41. The ideal society of Marx, Engels and Lenin cannot be established without an enormous, and at

present inconceivable increase in the productivity of labour. But this ideal society having come into existence, how long would it last if payment (or consumption) according to needs would 'inevitably' lower productivity ?

Q. 42. An attempt was made in Russia after the Revolution to reduce inequality of wages to a minimum. What was its effect on the productivity of labour ?

Q. 43. An attempt was made in Russia after the Revolution to abolish money. What was its effect on the productivity of labour ?

Q. 44. If socialism is built on a money economy, progressive piece-rates and inheritance, and if the abolition of money and inheritance, and the equalization of wages would bring down productivity, will socialism be 'inevitably' transformed into communism ?

Q. 45. Can this transformation ever take place, except in the imagination of Marxists ?

Q. 46. If 'free utilisation of the resources of society' is a utopia, does it not follow that 'withering away' of excesses, or violence, or of the repressive machinery called the State, is a utopia too ?

Q. 47. What shall we say about 'scientific' socialism which 'inevitably' lands us in a utopia ?

Q. 48. Can communism succeed except on an international scale ?

Q. 49. Suppose Russian socialism develops into communism. Excesses in Russia 'wither away,' the bureaucracy 'wither away,' the police and magistracy 'wither away,' and the armed forces of the State 'wither away'—in a word, the Russian State 'falls

asleep.' If the general process of 'withering away' was not complete in the countries to the east and west of Russia, is it not likely that with the 'withering away' of the State, Russia itself would 'wither away'?

Q. 50. Does it not follow that before any State 'withers away,' all States must simultaneously 'wither away?' And are we also not compelled to assume a uniform rate of 'withering away' for all States? For if a single State, *e.g.*, Russia with its enormous natural resources, were 'withering away' rapidly, while Japan's or Germany's progress towards the ideal society was slower, 'withering away' in the case of Russia might mean loss of independence or dismemberment.

Q. 51. Would it not follow that the external factor in the history of a country is a most important factor?

Q. 52. Does it not follow that the external factor may make it impossible for socialism in one country to ever develop into communism?

Q. 53. Except in the imagination of Marxists, what are the prospects of a world communist society being established, say, within the next 2000 years?

Q. 54. Have national differences and antagonisms between the peoples vanished, or are they vanishing, as Marx and Engels expected?

Q. 55. Is it not true that the development of the bourgeoisie and of capitalism has emphasized rather than weakened these differences and antagonisms?

Q. 56. Can a world communist society be established without a world proletarian revolution?

Q. 57. Who is working for such a revolution? Are Italy, Germany and Japan working for it? Are the

MARXISM IS DEAD

'peace-loving nations,' Russia, Britain and France, working for it?

Q. 58. Is the government of the whole world by a single world State a 'scientific' or a utopian conception?

Q. 59. Is the internationalization of world land and capital a 'scientific' or a utopian conception?

Q. 60. Will the thinly-peopled parts of the globe, now in the possession of 'white' races, be thrown open for colonisation to 'coloured' races under a world system of communism?

Q. 61. Have white settlers expressed their solidarity with coloured peoples in the matter of colonisation?

Q. 62. When no agreement is possible on such fundamental issues, is not the talk of a 'world State' and a 'world society' the purest 'scientific' bunkum?

RUSSIAN SOCIALISM

It is agreed that 'national' socialism is nonsense—it is only another name for 'Fascism.' It follows that socialism must be international. The form of socialism was described by Marx and Engels. Our object is to discover whether socialism in Russia conforms to the socialist society of Marx and Engels. The first batch of questions is concerned with Russian democracy, acclaimed as the greatest democracy in the world.

Q. 63. Mussolini, in replying to Hitler's speech welcoming his visit to Germany, said in Berlin on 28th September, 1937: "The grandest and truest democracies existing in the world at present are those of Italy and Germany" (*"Le piu grandi e piu autentiche democrazie esistenti attualmente nel mondo sono L'italiana e la*

tedesca”—*Il Popolo d'Italia*, dated 29th September, 1937). Do you admit Mussolini's claim?

Q. 64. The Leader of the Opposition in England is paid a salary of £2,000 a year, and is highly esteemed by Government. Would Mussolini give any one who stood up to oppose his rule a salary of £2,000 per annum, or put some lead into him?

Q. 65. Mussolini has no use for an opposition. In 1927 he said: "Here arises the problem: How to live without an opposition? Opposition is wanted because it is part of the picture (*perché sta bene nel quadro*). We reject this method of reasoning completely and scornfully. The opposition is not necessary to the functioning of a healthy political regime. The opposition is stupid, superfluous in a totalitarian regime like the Fascist regime"³ The meaning is that where all have turned Fascist there can be only one party, and there is no room for an opposition.

Do you accept the conception of democracy as one-Party system without an opposition? Is it democracy at all or dictatorship of a single party?

Q. 66. Is there an opposition in Russia? If a leader arose who opposed Stalin, would Stalin honour him, and give him a salary of £2,000 a year, or put some lead into him?

Q. 67. Is there any essential difference between the one-party system of Russia and that of Italy? Stalin said to Roy Howard on March 1st, 1936: "Where there are not several classes there cannot be several parties, for a party is part of a class." Is it not true that socialism

3 *Discorsi del*, 1927, pp. 122-23 (Edizioni 'Alpes,' Milan).

in Russia has abolished parties and opposition in the same sense in which Fascism has abolished parties and opposition in Italy?

Q. 68. Is it true that at the last elections in Russia, there were no election contests? Is it true, as alleged, that Stalin was the candidate everywhere? ⁴

Q. 69. If at the next elections in the Punjab the Government saw to it that one and only one candidate, belonging to the Unionist Party, stood for election from each constituency, would the Punjab become the greatest democracy in the world?

Q. 70. Is it admitted that democracy in Great Britain is different from democracy in Russia, so different that if Britain is a democracy the Russian regime is bureaucratic, or despotic—anything but democratic?

Q. 71. Does the Russian regime realize the socialist ideal of democracy? Marx rejected the 'Free State' of the Gotha programme. Is the Russian regime a 'Free State' in even the most restricted sense of the term?

Q. 72. Below are quoted passages from various authors which give the impression that the measure of freedom enjoyed by the Russian worker under socialism is less than that enjoyed by Indian workers in a country

⁴ *I Search for the Truth in Russia*, by Sir Walter Citrine, p. 348:—
 "There was only one candidate for each constituency, and as the voters had thus no choice in the matter, the election resolved itself into a vote of confidence in Stalin and the regime. All that the voter was required to do was to seal and place the ballot paper in the box provided. The only way by which an elector could express dissent was by defacing the ballot paper, or by refraining from voting. As the passport of every elector was checked at the time of voting, the authorities would thus have knowledge of anyone who refrained from voting, and it was to be expected that not many would willingly expose themselves to the suspicion of coldness or latent hostility towards the regime by failing to vote."

under Capitalist-Imperialist domination. Are these authors lying? Are there any good reasons for disbelieving them?

Sir Walter Citrine says (*I Search for the Truth in Russia*):—

“I seemed to sense a freer atmosphere in the Soviet factories. There was the wall newspaper as an example of this. Criticism of fellow-workers and factory administration methods was caustic and general in these: But was it really freedom? No worker could freely express his criticisms of the basic principles of the regime or of the ruling party or its leaders. I could not imagine any of them publicly or privately criticising Stalin, for example, any more than I could imagine a German worker criticising Hitler. Formerly the worker could criticise to his heart's content his particular Factory Manager or some Foreman, but even that was being discouraged as incompatible with sound administration. But did that mean freedom? Was the worker not coerced by a thousand and one methods?” (pp. 137-8).

“As to the increase in desertions from factories, these used to be very frequent some years ago. They were checked, however, very much by the institution of the passport system, under the decrees of 27th December, 1932, and 28th April, 1933, by which all Soviet citizens over 16 years of age residing in towns, workers' settlements, Soviet farms, industrial and transport undertakings, etc., were required to carry a passport. Only persons holding a passport for a particular district or zone were allowed to reside in such zone. These passports were issued by the police, and were ostensibly for the purpose of clearing the large cities of people who had no proper occupation or

means of livelihood, and 'to cleanse these places from kulak, criminal and other anti-social elements.' The passport has to be produced upon entry into employment, and is marked by the officials of the undertaking concerned with the date and particulars of engagement. This system, which resembled that which existed in Tsarist days, consequently placed a good deal of disciplinary power in the hands of the police and of the managements of the undertakings. Workers who frequently absented themselves from their employment, ran the risk of their permission to stay in the district being withdrawn, and might find themselves relegated to another part of the country. It is rather surprising, therefore, to read that widespread desertions have again occurred." (Ibid. p. 375)

Comrade Yvon gives a similar description of the passport system. If a worker loses his passport he is fined 3 roubles or more (the cost of the card is only a few kopeks). The loss inflicted on the worker is equal to a day's salary for the lowest paid workers, those earning 80 roubles a month (p. 47). It is not possible to leave a factory without the permission of the 'triangle'—that is, director of the factory, president of the Trade Union Committee, and secretary of the local Communist Party.

"Changing the Kolkhoz (collective farm) or leaving it is as difficult as changing a factory. By doing so one loses all, or almost all, that one possessed before being 'collectivised.' Going away without anything, the peasant has no hope of creating a new personal enterprise, and less hope still of finding a place in another Kolkhoz.

"One is thus really attached to the factory as to the soil ; one cannot change at will one's work or one's town

except at risk and with difficulties much greater than those under the Tsarist regime. On the other hand one cannot refuse to agree, without risk, to changes of labourers which the 'plan' considers necessary. Is it not serfdom?"

Discontented workers cannot easily leave Russia. The only means of escape is 'flight' (*la fuite*, p. 50). "For a common mortal to demand a passport is not only to spend 30 roubles without any result, but to be adjudged a malcontent, which is an exceptionally grave charge."

Crossing the frontier without a passport is punishable, for civilians, with death, or 10 years' imprisonment, for soldiers with death only. Members of age of a military deserter's family are punished with 5—10 years' imprisonment if they knew the desertion and failed to give information; failing to know it, they are punished with 5 years' deportation to Siberia. Comrade Yvon adds:

"Let us remember that this relates to times of peace."

"This explains why one does not meet Soviet citizens in the West who might be able to tell the truth about the Bolshevik regime, and it shows how great must be the urge to get out of the U.S.S.R. which has to be suppressed by such hateful measures" (pp. 50-51).

In *After-thoughts on the U.S.S.R.*, André Gide says (pp. 30-33):—

"The Soviet worker is tied to his factory as the agricultural labourer to his Sovkhose or his Kolkhoze, and as Ixion to his wheel. If for any reason, because he hopes to be a little better or a little less ill-off elsewhere, he wants to change, let him beware. Regimented, classed, caged, he runs the risk of being refused everywhere."

Even if he leaves his factory, without changing his town, he is deprived of the lodging to which his work entitles him (not that he gets it free) and which is extremely difficult to procure. On leaving, he is docked of a large part of his salary if he is a factory worker, and if he is a Kolkhosian, he loses all the benefit of his collectivised work. On the other hand, a worker cannot refuse to move when he is ordered to. He is free neither to go nor stay where he pleases, where perhaps he may be drawn or held by love or friendship.”*

*“Just as the State has sovereign control over the material elements of the economic process, so it has dictatorial control over the human element. The workers are no longer free to sell their labour power where or as they please ; they have not the right to move freely in the territory of the U.S.S.R. (interior passports !) ; the right to strike is suppressed, and any inclination to resist Stakhanovite methods exposes them to the severest penalties.”

Lucien Laurat : *Coup d'oeil sur l'Economie Russe. L'Homme Réel*. (No. 38, February, 1937).

André Gide continues :—

“An excellent way of getting on is to turn informer. It puts you in the good books of the police ; they then protect you, but at the same time make use of you ; for once you have started, neither honour nor friendship counts. On you must go. For that matter, it is easy to get into the way of it. And the spy is safe . . .

“One ends by suspecting every thing and everyone. The innocent talk of children may be your ruin. One doesn't dare speak in front of them. Everyone watches everyone else, watches his own words, is himself watched.

No more ease, no more free speaking, except perhaps in bed with one's wife, if one is really sure of her . . .

"In order to be safe from informers, the most satisfactory way is to be beforehand with them. For that matter, those who have heard ugly-sounding remarks without immediately reporting them are liable to imprisonment or deportation. Spying is one of the civic virtues. One is brought up to it from the earliest age, and the child who 'tells tales' is complimented."

Fenner Brockway speaks of 'terror' in Russia (*Workers' Front*, p. 190) De Basily thus describes "The Stalin Regime of Fear" (*Russia under Soviet Rule*, p. 473) :—

"Despots of the Stalin type must fear forces of any kind, including those they themselves have called into being. Hence, under the absolute power of this leader, 'the land of the workers' has been transformed into a sort of Oriental satrapy which, in its lack of principle and its contempt for the human being, has far surpassed the empire of Abdul Hamid. The constant terrorist repression directed against leading members of the communist party, against the high command of the army and prominent administrative and economic officials, together with the threatening attacks against scholars and writers, are so many manifestations of the Stalin despotism intended primarily to leave before the dictator nothing but an impalpable human dust. Stalin destroys everything that dares show the slightest disposition towards independence, everything that claims the tiniest personal place in the sun.

"Soviet events once more confirm the old truth: Revolution, like Saturn, devours its children. The men of the Bolshevik revolution are perishing one after the other,

victims in their turn of the barbarous terror they once employed for their own ends. But simultaneously Stalin is destroying many elements which contributed a certain stability and a certain intelligence to the internal relations of the U. S. S. R."

In *Anarcho-Syndicalism* Rudolf Rocker says (pp. 96-7):—

"Russia is today farther from socialism than any other country. Dictatorship does not lead to the economic and social liberation of the toiling masses, but to the suppression of even the most trivial freedom and the development of an unlimited despotism which respects no rights and treads underfoot every feeling of human dignity. What the Russian worker has gained economically under this regime is a most ruinous form of human exploitation, borrowed from the most extreme stage of capitalism, in the shape of the Stakhanov system, which raises his productive capacity to its highest limit and degrades him to a galley slave, who is denied all control of his personal labour and who must submit to every order of his superiors if he does not wish to expose himself to penalties of life and liberty. But compulsory labour is the last road that can lead to socialism. It estranges the man from the community, destroys his joy in his daily work, and stifles that sense of personal responsibility to his fellows without which there can be no talk of socialism at all."

Eugene Lyons bade farewell to Russia with these reflexions (*Assignment in Utopia*, p. 603):—

"Above all, I had the sense of leaving behind me a nation trapped. Trapped physically, with bloodhounds and machine-guns and death sentences guarding the frontiers to prevent people from escaping, with a passport

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS

system to prevent them from moving freely inside the frontiers, with endless *ukases* and threats to regulate their existence. Trapped intellectually, with every thought prescribed and mental curiosity punished as heresy; the new literacy seemed an additional taunt, sharpening the appetite while denying it sustenance. Trapped spiritually through the need of pretending enthusiasm for the knout, genuflecting to hateful images and practising hypocrisy as the first law of survival. In the past, the world freedom had been whispered in secret caves, but now punishment was too swift and too deadly. There was no longer even the solace of martyrdom for the defiant; a technique had been evolved for breaking their spirit and dragging them into the limelight for slobbering confessions of guilt.

"The fact that these things had come to pass under the banners of 'socialism' only made them more ghastly. The word socialism, the eternal dream of equality and justice, was also trapped."

The writers quoted above—Sir Walter Citrine, Comrade Yvon, André Gide, Lucien Laurat, Fenner Brockway, De Basily, Rudolf Rocker, and Eugene Lyons—may, or may not be all Fascists or disciples of Mussolini and Hitler, or agents of the bourgeoisie, or lackeys of capital. We are not concerned with that. The question is whether what they allege is true :

- (i) Is there in the U.S.S.R. a passport system which prevents workers from moving freely inside the frontiers ?
- (ii) Is the industrial worker virtually tied to his factory, and the agricultural worker to his collective farm ?
- (iii) Can workers freely criticise the basic principles

MARXISM IS DEAD

of the regime, or the ruling party, or its leaders?

- (iv) Do Soviet citizens live in continual fear of spies and informers?
- (v) Is there justification for speaking of 'terror' in Russia and of 'the Stalin regime of fear'?
- (vi) Will it be correct to say that Marxism is 'alive and growing' in a country where the freedom enjoyed by workers is little different from serfdom—physical, intellectual and moral? Will it not be more correct to say that in the U.S.S.R. Marxism is dead, dead like the dodo?

Q. 73. What is the basis of economic classes? What does exploitation consist in?

Q. 74. Suppose, under a system of State ownership of means of production, the majority of workers lead a miserable life, while all the good things of the world are enjoyed by a small, privileged class. Is exploitation of man by man at an end under such conditions?

Q. 75. What was the real ground for the condemnation of private property in means of production by Marx and Engels—that private property was private property or that by its means the bourgeoisie enriched itself at the cost of the worker—that the worker died of starvation, was scarcely ever in a position 'to use a thread of woollen clothing,' for food 'got what was too bad for the property-holding class,' etc.?

Q. 76. Is there differentiation of income in the U.S.S.R.? When prices are the same for all consumers, and incomes range between 80 roubles and 20,000 or 30,000 roubles, will not the poorest workers have difficulty in keeping their bodies and souls together, while the

labour aristocracy and bureaucrats live like the bourgeois?

Q. 77. Under such conditions can we speak of the class-struggle as having ended in the U.S.S.R.?

Q. 78. Were such differences in income contemplated by Marx, Engels and Lenin even in the first phase of communism?

Q. 79. Socialism, according to Soviet leaders, has been achieved in the U.S.S.R. And the purchasing power of the average industrial worker in Russia under socialism is not greater than that of the average industrial worker in Bombay, is about half of that of the German industrial worker, and about one-fourth of that of the British industrial worker. Does it not follow that if the private capitalist exploits the worker and appropriates his surplus value in India, Germany and England, the all-powerful State exploits the Russian worker in an equal or higher degree?

Q. 80. Is it true that the proportion of the total family income spent on food by the average workman in Russia is 67 per cent as compared with about 50 per cent or less in Ahmedabad and Bombay? What conclusions regarding the standard of living of the average worker in socialist Russia are suggested by this proportion?

Q. 81. Did Marx praise piece-wages as the form of wage payment best suited to, or most in harmony with socialism?

Q. 82. What is the attitude of socialists and communists in capitalist countries toward the piece-work system? Is Sir Walter Citrine right when he says (*loc. cit.*, p. 158):—

“What was the truth about the piece-work system?”

Was piece-work good in itself? I did not believe any Trade Unionist would say it was. It deprived men of any sense of personality, and it was simply an appeal to the acquisitive sense and even the greed of the individual. Yet here it was in this country more lavishly employed than anywhere else."

Q. 83. Is Comrade Yvon right when he says (loc. cit., p. 43) :—

"Actually as a consequence of Stakhanovism, the piece-work system, with premiums for extra production, has been made general, the famous 'sweating system' which capitalism had not succeeded in imposing on workers" ?

Q. 84. Methods of 'speeding up' in Europe and America, and in the Soviet Union are described in parallel columns below :

Lapidus and Ostrovityanov

(*Political Economy*, p. 87).

"In the modern Ford factories the so-called conveyer system is particularly widely applied; an endless platform passes from one department to another and supplies the worker with materials for his work (iron, for example), the finished work (a turned axle, for instance) is put back on the platform and passes into the next department, where the article is subjected to further working up (the wheels are fitted to the axle, for example), and so on. The moving conveyer, continually supplying material and demanding its working up within a certain period, acts better than verbal orders.

"Here in very deed man is transformed into an automaton, into a soulless accessory to a machine.

Fred E. Beal

(*Word from Nowhere*, pp. 240-1).

"Communists in America fought piece-work. It was our stock demand: *Abolition of piece-work!* In many of the capitalist factories production men have found they could get a better grade of work and more of it if they left it to the man to work on his own initiative. In Russia, however, piece-work is one of Stalin's main levers of production. Every department of the Kharkov Tractor Plant was on piece-work. They do not trust the workers on straight time. And the speed-up! Another one of our stock demands in America was: *Abolition of the speed-up!* But in our plant efficiency men from the Soviet Tractor Trust worked day and night figuring out how to speed up the workers, how to make the belt move faster.

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS

"A particularly vigorous intensification of labour occurs under the Taylor system, which under the name of 'scientific organization of labour,' and 'rationalization of production,' is being more and more widely adopted not only in its homeland, America, but in Europe also."

"Communists in Detroit rave against the monotonous life-sucking belt system operating at the Ford plant. Had I not done so myself in Pontiac, Michigan? But I never heard a word uttered against its use in Soviet Russia. The belt system is in the assembling department. It is here that the tractor or automobile comes to life, beginning with the placing of the chassis on the moving platform. The assembly line (belt) moves on, workmen on each side slip in the various parts needed in building the machine. Finally—the line moving all the time—all the parts are fitted and the finished car moves off the conveyor. The trouble with the Kharkov Tractor Plant was that the belt or conveyor never moved fast enough for the Communist bosses.

"The Stalinists justify piece-work and the speed-up by saying it is for the greater cause of Socialism. Every hardship, every iniquity and every injustice was being perpetrated in the holy name of the Revolution and the Class-less Society! At the same time the Stalin policy created more classes among the Russian workers than under capitalism and suppressed with a mailed fist every true radical and revolutionary manifestation on the part of the masses."

Is there any good reason for thinking that a system which transforms the worker into an automaton under capitalism does not do so under socialism?

Q. 85. How can a system of wage-payment which intensifies greed and the acquisitive sense become the chief means of transforming socialism into communism?

MARXISM IS DEAD

STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

Q. 86. Is one per cent per annum an abnormally high rate of increase for man?

Q. 87. Increasing steadily at this rate the population of India would reach a total of 2,000,000,000 (world population in 1931) in 175 years. Can India support 2,000,000,000 without a fall in the standard of living? Is it possible for the supply of food in the strictest sense of the term to keep pace with the growth of numbers when population is doubling at the end of every 70 years?

Q. 88. Growing numbers require more living room, more food and more material requisites of well-being. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that world resources as a whole are adequate to meet the requirements of world population increasing at the rate of 1 per cent annually, is that true of the resources of small, over-crowded countries like Germany, Italy and Japan?

Q. 89. Admitting that man is a producer, and not merely a gatherer, is it possible, by changing the 'mode of production,' to indefinitely increase agricultural yields?

Q. 90. If not, does it not follow that war and conquest or imperialist aggression has its roots in economic necessity?

Q. 91. Lenin interpreted imperialism in terms of the 'mode of production' and the 'class-struggle,' ignoring the struggle for existence completely. Suppose the world is divided into a number of socialist States with unequal resources and unequal opportunities for expansion. Will not socialist States fight for markets and territory as capitalist States do now?

Q. 92. Suppose capitalism is transformed into communism in England, or that the class-struggle and the domination of finance capital come to an end there. Will

that set Britain free from the struggle for existence? Losing their Empire, would the British people be able to maintain their present standard of living?

Q. 93. There is little finance capital across our North-West Frontier. Is there no threat to Indian independence from that quarter? The question cannot be answered in the negative without forgetting the past 1000 years of Indian history. If the answer is (as it must be) in the affirmative, does the source of danger lie in imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, or hunger, that is imperialism as an expression of the struggle for existence?

THE SOCIALIST-IMPERIALIST ALLIANCE

Q. 94. Has there been any change in the foreign policy of Russia since Hitler's rise to power?

Q. 95. Explain why 'the base of the world revolution' and 'the cradle of the revolutionary struggle all over the world' has become a 'bulwark' for peace.

Q. 96. What is left of Marxism if the only socialist country in the world which, professedly, follows Marx, bases its collaboration with other countries 'on the principle of the peaceful co-existence of two systems—the socialist and the capitalist' (Litvinov).

Q. 97. The following Reuter's cable dated London, May 15, relating to the Soviet reply to the British counter-proposals, appeared in the daily papers dated May 16th, 1939:—

"While absolute reserve is maintained in British official quarters with regard to the contents of the Russian reply, it is understood the Soviet considers British proposals unsatisfactory, because they do not go far enough and do not even indirectly guarantee the Soviet territory, besides leaving a gap between Poland

and Finland, where the border States are not covered. The possibility of direct attack against the Soviet territory is not taken into account.

"Therefore the reply, it is alleged, presses for a mutual assistance pact that will cover both direct and indirect attacks not only upon the territories of the guaranteed States but upon those of the contracting parties."

As a good and true Marxist, a believer in the class-struggle and a world revolutionary, justify the Soviet point of view as expressed in this cable.

Q. 98. Assuming that this cable states the truth (it may be an attempt on the part of a capitalist-bourgeois news-agency to discredit socialism), explain why the Soviet wants Britain and France to guarantee Soviet territory, whether directly or indirectly.

Q. 99. Suppose a mutual assistance pact, such as the Soviet wants, materializes. Will the pact be a means of intensifying the class-struggle all over the world, or of establishing a world communist society?

Q. 100. Is it the class-struggle or the struggle for existence which compels the Soviet to seek a military alliance with the world's greatest imperialist powers?

Q. 101. Did Marx and Engels contemplate an alliance between socialism and finance capital as a means of realizing the aims of revolutionary socialism?

Q. 102. The Soviet would impose an obligation on British and French imperialism which the latter seems unwilling to undertake—that of guaranteeing socialist territory. In return, the Soviet is ready to guarantee imperialist territory—such, in plain words, is the meaning of a military alliance between Russia, France and Britain. Does it not follow:

(i) that the talk of the 'world revolution' and of Russia

being 'the base' of the world revolution is devoid of all sense?

(ii) that the class-struggle has vanished into thin air?

(iii) that the threatened conflict in Europe has nothing whatever to do with ideologies (socialism, fascism, capitalism, democracy or dictatorship) but is a struggle between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots'?

'INDIAN SOCIALISM'

Q. 103. What is the strength of the industrial proletariat in India? Keeping in view its numbers, its heterogeneous character, its lack of education and general enlightenment, and its ignorance of industrial technique and political administration, is it possible for our industrial proletariat to win *swaraj* and establish its dictatorship?

Q. 104. Is it not true that under Indian conditions 'dictatorship of the proletariat' means dictatorship of leaders of the proletariat? Is it not true that 'the struggle for power' in India is a struggle for leadership?

Q. 105. "Who will control Congress Ministries? Who will conduct negotiations with the Viceroy?" Do these questions sum up with substantial accuracy 'the struggle for power' in India?

Q. 106. If the interests of workers of different nations are not identical, if no world proletarian revolution is maturing or can ever happen, if no world socialist society can ever come into being—in brief, if international socialism is dead, does it not follow that socialism must be 'national'?

Q. 107. Is there a socialist pattern which every country must accept irrespective of its peculiar national characteristics, political position and degree of economic development?

Q. 108. 'Indian socialism' is emphatically not a demand for setting up a 'Corporate State' in India as in Italy, or for copying Fascist methods of imperialist aggression. Is there any reason why 'Indian socialism' must mean State capitalism as in the U.S.S.R.?

Q. 109. What are the objections to interpreting 'Indian socialism' as an economy or system aiming at a just distribution and a planned production of wealth under given Indian conditions?

Q. 110. Ignoring the moral and political aspects of the question, will not *swaraj* be of enormous economic value to the country as a whole?

Q. 111. Considering the supreme importance of winning *swaraj*, is not the form of our economic organization, when *swaraj* comes, a wholly minor issue at present?

Q. 112. Is there sense in dividing the country into parties and factions on the question of our economic constitution under *swaraj* when no *swaraj* has been won and when, in fact, there are not the faintest signs of the commencement of any real struggle for *swaraj*?

Q. 113. The class-struggle is the Marxian method of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Consider the application of this method to India, that is to a dependent country where the proletariat is practically non-existent.

Q. 114. Did civil war contribute in any degree to the weakening of China? Is civil war responsible in any measure for the defeat and humiliation of China?

Q. 115. The class-struggle was deliberately started in Spain. What has Spain gained thereby?

Q. 116. What reasons are there for thinking that the class-struggle will achieve freedom for India when it has been successful in accomplishing the ruin of independent countries?

INDEX

(Names and Works cited)

- Adoratsky, 70
Affairs of China, 228 n.
After-Thoughts on the U.S.S.R., 249
Against Aggression, 189 n.
Ana-cho-Syndicalism, 252
Andrew Smith, 172 n
Angell, Sir Norman, 219
Anti-Duehring, 28 n., 36, 59 n., 62
Archiv fuer Rechts und Sozialphilosophie, 124 n.
Ashton, H. S., 221
Assignment in Utopia, 252
Basily, De, 142 n., 168 n., 170-71, 251
Batsell, 124 n.
Bazard, St. Amand. Chapter I
Beal, Fred, E., 256
Beitraege zur deut. Kolonialfrage, 215 n.
Birchall, F. E., 113 n.
Borkenau, 129-30 n.
Brit. Col. Empire and the German Claim, 217 et seq
Brockway, Fenner, 127 n., 128 n., 139, 251
Bukharin, N. 1., 82, 108-09, 188, 233
Pury, J. B., 205 n.
Caland, Prof., 102
Cambridge Ancient History, 206 n.
C. and M. Gazette, Lahore, 52
Case of Leon Trotsky, 120 n.
Case of the Anti-Soviet Block of Rights and Trotskyites, 82
Ce qu'est devenue la Revolution Russe, 135
Citrine, Sir Walter, 143 et seq., 246 n., 247
Civil War in France, 89-90 n.
Clamour for Colonies, 221 n.
Coates, W. P. and Zelda K., 161 n., 165 n.
Cohn, A. W., 109 n.
Cole, G. D. H., 25
Communist International, 129 n.
Communist Manifesto, 2 and n., etc.
Conception of Matter according to Nyaya Vaisesika, 31 n.
Condition of the Working Class in England, 138 n.
Coup d'oil sur l'Economie Russe, 250
Critique of the Gotha Programme, 18, 183, etc.
Diehl, Karl, 21
Doctrine de Saint Simon, Chapter I
Economic Recovery of Germany, 175
Encyclopaedia of Labour, 21.
Engels, F., on : Condition of the Brit. working class, 138; negation of the negation, 59 et seq.; quantity and quality, 27 et seq.; socialism in one country, 71; the State, 85.
For Peace and Friendship, 127
From Tsardom to the Stalin Constitution, 161 n.
Fos, William and Gerhaty, 231 n.
Gandhi, Mahatma, 95 et seq., 113 n., 115
Garbe, Richard, 30 and n., 31, 32 and n.
Gelesnoff, Prof. A. W., 44 and n.
Geldverkehr in Sowjet Russland, Der, 109 n., 162



Gide, André, 249
 Gini, Dr. Corrado, 214
Grundfrage deut. Wirtschaftspolitik, 213 n.
Grundzüge d. Volkswirtschaftslehre, 45 n.
 Guillebaud, C. W., 175 n., 176-77
 Haldane, J. B. S., 24 et seq.
Handwoerterbuch d. Staatswissenschaften, 21, 206 n.
 Haslett, A. W., 195 n.
Hiller's Official Programme, 211 n., 216
Historian's History of the World, 207 n.
History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), 92 and n., 130 n., 162, 163 n., 234
History of Greece, 205 n.
 Hoewel, Dr. Paul, 213
Holy Family, 65
 Howard, Roy, 125 n., 134 n.
 Hubbard, 145, 166, 169
Il Sentimento dello Stato, 131 n.
Indian Philosophy, 26 n.
Indian Socialism, 40, 45
I Search for the Truth in Russia, 144 et seq.
 Ishimaru, Lt. Tota, 131 n.
I Was a Soviet Worker, 172 n.
 Jacob, Dr. E. G., 212
Japan Must Fight Britain, 131 n.
 Jawahar Lal Nehru, Pandit, 174
 Jongh, W. G. De, 100
 Kaganovitch, 181
 Kanada, Sage, 30
Kann das Geld abgeschafft werden, 109 n.
 Kapila, Sage, 29
 Kautsky, 201
 Keith, A. Berriedale, 30
 Khodjayev, Faizulla, 203 n.

Kieler Vortraege, 214
 Kingsmill, Hugh and Muggridge, Malcolm, 82
Kolonialpolitisches Quellenheft, 212 n.
 Krestinsky, 109
 Lapidus and Ostrovityanov, 185, 187, 256
 Lariu, 108
 Lavrov, 193 n.
 Laurat, Lucien, 250
 Lenin on: absolute impoverishment of the worker, 67; democracy, 97; experts' salaries, 143; inevitability of social revolution, 67; Imperialism, 197 et seq.; non-violence, 98; relativity, 29; the State, 86-7 n.; law of uneven development 73
Leninism, 73 n., 198 n.
 Leontiev, A., 47 and n., 67 n., 74 n., 186
 Litvinov, Maxim. 188-89 n., 190 n.
 Lunn, Arnold, 225 n.
 Lyons, Eugene, 252.
 Maisky, M., 127
Marx-Engels Marxism, 42 n., 100 n.
 Manoileso, Mihailil, 48 et seq.
 Marx on: conversion of money into capital, 33 et seq.; exploitation, 40 et seq.; internationalism, 121; negation of the negation, 63, 65; overpopulation, 193-94; Paris Commune, 89; piece-wages, 182 et seq., profits in agriculture, 46
Marx-Engels, Selected Correspondence, 40, 42 n., 46 n., 72
Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences, 24 et seq.
 Mercier, E., 146 n., 172 and n.
 Mezhlauk, V. I., 110, 135, 181
 Molotov, 135, 179

INDEX

- My Experiences in China*, 229 n.
- Nature of the Capitalist Crisis, The*, 235
- New Data for Lenin's Imperialism*, 188 n.
- Outline of Political Economy* (Lapidus and Ostrovityanov), 43 n.
- Panunzio, Sergio, 83, 84
- People's Paper*, 72
- Political Economy* (Leontiev), 43 n., 47 n.
- Planck, Max, 23 n.
- Poverty of Philosophy*, 84, 85 n.
- Principles of Communism* (Engels), 71
- Radhakrishnan, Sir, 26 n.
- Red Star Over China*, 229 n.
- Reports: Family Budgets of Ahmedabad workers*, 167; wage cen., engineering industry, 150 n. 154 n.; textile industries, 167
- Remonstrantie, De* (W. G. De Jongh), 103-04
- Rocker, Rudolf, 252.
- Rohstofffragen d. deut. Volksernahrung*, 213 n.
- Roy, Mr. M. N., 75, 229 n.
- Russian Revolution, The* (Roy) 75 n.
- Russia Under Soviet Rule*, 142.
- Russische Währungsreform des Jahres*, 1924, 110 n
- Russia Without Illusions*, 134 n.
- Samkhya Karika*, 32 n
- Samkhya Philosophie, Die*, 30 n.
- Science of Public Finance*, 51 n.
- Selected Works* (Lenin), 82, 85, etc.
- Sismondi, 9.
- Sloan, Pat, 134 n., 164.
- Smith, Adam, 205-06.
- Snow, Edgar, 229-30 n.
- Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 86 n.
- Soviet Communism*, 164.
- Soviet Comes of Age, The*, 165 and n.
- Soviet Rule in Russia*, 123 n.
- Soviet Trade and Distribution*, 145 n.
- Soviet Union*, 1936, 19, etc.
- Spanish Arena, The*, 231 n.
- Stalin, J., 73 n.
- State and Revolution*, 85.
- Statesman, The* (Calcutta), 132 n.
- Strachey, John, 235.
- Tativa Kaumudi*, 27 n, 29 n.
- Teichman, Sir Eric, 228 n.
- Theorie du Protectionisme*, 48.
- This Have and Have-Not Business*, 219-20 n.
- Trotsky, Leon, 120 n., 126 n., 139 n., 141 n., 182 n.
- Ueber Sozialismus Kommunismus und Anarchismus*, 21.
- Umsh Misra, 29.
- Unsolved Problems of Science*, 195 n.
- U.S.S.R. Réflexions*, 146, 172.
- Value, Price and Profit*, 67, 235 n.
- Varga and Mendelssohn, 188 n.
- Vyshinsky, 82.
- Wealth of Nations*, 205 n.
- Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 51 n.
- Westermann, D., 215 n.
- What Marx Really Meant*, 25 n.
- Where is Science Going?* 33 n.
- Word from Nowhere*, 256.
- Workers' Front*, 127 n., 139, 251, 226 n., 231 n.
- Yvon, Comrade, 133 et seq.
- Ziegelmayr, Dr. W., 213 n.